Political History of Islam (2)

HISTORY OF THE CALIPHS

From The Death of the Messenger (s) to the Decline of The Umayyad Dynasty 11-132 AH

By:Rasūl Ja'farīan
Translated by:
Ali Ebrahimi

تاریخ سیاسی اسلام (۲)

تاریخ خلفا

(۱۳۲-۱۱ه)

Ansariyan Publications
P . O Box 187
22 Shohada Str. Qom
Islamic Republic Of Iran
Tel:+98 251 7741774 Fax: 7742674
Email: ansarian@noornet.net
www.ansariyan.org
www.ansariyan.net

Graphic Design: Akbari
Tel:+98 251 7748406

HISTORY OF THE CALIPHS

From The Death of the Messenger (s) to the Decline of The Umayyad Dynasty 11-132 AH

Vol.2

By:
Rasūl Ja'farīan

Translated by:
Ali Ebrahimi

Ja'farīan, Rasūl, 1965 -
History of the Caliphs: From The Death of the Messenger (s) to the Decline of The Umayyad Dynasty 11-132 AH/ by Rasul Ja'fariyan; translated by Ali Ebrahimi.- Qum: Ansariyan, 2003.
664 P.
Original title: تاریخ خلفا
Including bibliographical references.
ISBN: 964-438-457-1
1. Islām – History – Early to 750. 2. Caliphs, orthodox. 3. Umayyads – History. 4. Caliphate. I.Ebrahimi, Ali tr. II.Title.
297.912 BP14.J3H5

تاریخ خلفا ج۲

HISTORY OF THE CALIPHS

From The Death of the Messenger (s) to the Decline of The Umayyad Dynasty 11-132 AH

Author: Rasūl Ja'farīan
Translated by: Ali Ebrahimi
Publisher: Ansariyan Publications – Qum
First Edition 1382 – 1424 - 2003
Negheen Press Quantity: 2000
Number of Pages: 664 Size: 162X229
ISBN: 964-438-457-1

ALL RIGHTS RECORDED AND RESERVED FOR THE PUBLISHER

Ansariyan Publications
P.O. Box 187
22 Shohada St., Qum
Islamic Republic of Iran
Tel: ++89 251 7741744 Fax: 7742647
Email: ansarian@noornet.net
www.ansariyan.org & www.ansariyan.net

IN THE NAME OF ALLAH,
ALL-COMPASSIONATE AND ALL-MERCIFUL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

ABŪ BAKR'S CALIPHATE 11
SAQĪFA 11
CALIPHATE AFTER THE PROPHET (S) 21
THE ISSUE OF APOSTASY 24
ABŪ BAKR'S AGENTS 34
CONQUEST OF DAMASCUS 38
CONQUEST OF IRAQ 43

CHAPTER II

'UMAR'S CALIPHATE 51
ABOUT CALIPH II 51
THE CALIPH'S CHARACTER 55
'UMAR'S FUNCTIONARIES 59
THOUGHTS OF THE SECOND CALIPH 67
'UMAR'S MURDER 86
CONTINUED CONQUESTS IN DAMASCUS AND EGYPT 91
CONTINUED CONQUESTS IN IRAQ AND THE CONQUEST OF IRAN 97
ABOUT IRAN'S CONQUEST 106

CHAPTER III

'UTHMĀN'S CALIPHATE 111
CALIPHATE COUNCIL AND 'UTHMĀN'S ELECTION 111
'UTHMĀN'S CALIPHATE 123
REASONS OF ANTI-'UTHMĀN REBELLION 125
'UTHMĀN'S OPPONENTS 134
'UTHMĀN'S CONTACT WITH DISSENTERS 142
'UTHMĀN AND MU'ĀWIYA 152
IMĀM 'ALī (A) AND 'UTHMĀN 154
ASSASSINATION OF 'UTHMĀN 160
ONGOING VICTORIES 164
EFFECTS OF VICTORIES AND ISLAMIC COMMUNITY 165

CHAPTER IV

IMĀM 'ALĪ'S IMAMATE 173

IMĀM 'ALĪ ALONGSIDE THE PROPHET 173
IMĀM 'ALĪ AND CALIPHS 178
SHI'ISM DURING IMĀM'S CALIPHATE 184
PEOPLE'S ALLEGIANCE TO 'ALĪ (A) 198
IMĀM'S PROBLEMS 210
REFORMATION, IMĀM'S FUNDAMENTAL POLICY 217
IMĀM IN THE FACE OF INFIDELS (DJAMAL WAR) 223
IMĀM STAYS IN KŪFA 240
WAR WITH OPPRESSIVELY PERVERSE PEOPLE IN ṢIFFĪN 243
WAR WITH EXTREMIST KHĀRIDJITES 270
THE KHĀRIDJITES, FORMATION AND CHARACTERISTICS 276
INVASIONS OF DAMASCUS ARMY 284
IMĀM 'ALĪ'S MARTYRDOM 292
IMĀM 'ALĪ'S LIFE 294

CHAPTER V

IMĀM ḤASAN'S IMAMATE 299
ACQUAINTANCE WITH THE KŪFIYĀNS 299
IMĀM ḤASAN'S CHARACTER 303
IMĀM MUDJTABĀ AND IMAMATE 307
FIRST ACTIONS OF IMĀM AND MU'ĀWIYA 313
MU'ĀWIYA AND REQUEST FOR COMPROMISE 319
WHY THE COMPROMISE WAS ACCEPTED 320
IMĀM ḤUSAYN (A) AND COMPROMISE 326
PEACE PACT 328
IMĀM MUDJTABĀ'S CHARACTER 333
IMĀM ḤASAN'S MARTYDOM 335

CHAPTER VI

MU'ĀWIYA'S MONARCHY 339
MU'ĀWIYA, THE FOUNDER OF THE UMAYYAD MONARCHY 339
SHI'ITE MUSLIMS IN MU'ĀWIYA'S TIME 354
THE SUPPRESSION OF ḤUDJR IBN 'ADĪ'S SHI'ITES MOVEMENT 363
REPERCUSSIONS OF ḤUDJR'S MARTYRDOM 368
CONQUESTS IN MU'ĀWIYA'S TIME 370
THE KHĀRIDJITES IN MU'ĀWIYA'S TIME 372
MU'ĀWIYA'S ENDEAVOR FOR HEREDITARY CALIPHATE 377

CHAPTER VII

KARBALĀ MOVEMENT 387
IMĀM ḤUSAYN BEFORE KARBALĀ' 387
IMĀM ḤUSAYN'S OPPOSITION TO YAZĀD'S CALIPHATE 393
DISPATCHING MUSLIM TO KūFA 395
IMāM'S MOVE TOWARDS IRAQ 399
THE PEOPLE OF KūFA AND KARBALā EVENT 401

KŪFA UNDER THE PRESSURE OF IBN ZIYĀD 403
ASSESSING THE TRAVEL TO IRAQ 408
IMĀM VERSUS IRAQI ARMY 415
THE ELEMENT OF INVISIBILITY IN KARBALĀ 423
THE ROLE OF RELIGIOUS DEVIATIONS IN KARBALĀ EVENT 425
POLITICAL IMPACTS OF THE EVENT OF KARBALĀ ON SHI'ISM .. 429

CHAPTER VIII

TRANSFER OF CALIPHATE TO THE MARWĀNIDS 433
DISPUTE BETWEEN ḤIDJĀZ AND DAMASCUS 433
THE BATTLE OF ḤARRA WĀQIM 434
THE PENITENTS' MOVEMENT IN 65 A.H 440
HERE SOME POINTS MERIT ATTENTION AS REGARDS TO THE PENITENTS 447
MUKHTĀR'S UPRISING (66, 67 A.H.) 449

CHAPTER IX

IMĀM SADJDJĀD (A) 465
IMĀM SADJDJĀD(A) 465
IMĀM SADJDJĀD AND SHI'ITE MUSLIMS 471
IMĀM'S ENCOUNTER WITH THE UMAYYADS 476
IMĀM SADJDJĀD'S PROFITING FROM DU'Ā (PRAYER) 479
IMĀM SADJDJĀD AND SLAVES 483
THE HĀSHIMITES AFTER THE EVENT OF KARBALĀ' 485

CHAPTER X

THE MARWĀNIDS' GOVERNMENT 493
ĀL MARWĀN'S RULE 493
ḤADJDJĀDJ IN IRAQ 499
'ABD AL-RAḤMĀN IBN ASH'ATH'S RIOT 504
'UMAR IBN 'ABD AL-'AZĪZ'S ADMINISTRATION 508
ENCOUNTERING THE SHI'ITE MUSLIMS 509
ENCOUNTERING THE KHĀRIDJITES 512
STANDING AGAINST CRUELTY AND PUBLIC EXTORTION 513
YAZĪD IBN 'ABD AL-MALIK'S SUCCESSION 516
YAZĪD IBN MUHALLAB'S UPRISING 518
HISHĀM IBN 'ABD AL-MALIK'S SUCCESSION 522
KHĀRIDJITES' REBELLION IN TIME OF THE MARWĀNIDS 525
THE FOUNDATION OF THE KHĀRIDJITES' PRINCIPLES 531

CHAPTER XI

SHI'ITE MUSLIMS IN THE LAST DECADES OF THE UMAYYAD STATE 535
THE SHI'ITE MUSLIMS UNDER THE PRESSURE OF THE UMAYYADS 535

INTERNAL EVENTS OF SHI'ITE MUSLIMS 538
EXAGGERATION AND THE EXAGGERATORS..... 539
CONFRONTATION OF IMĀMS WITH THE EXAGGERATORS 542
SHI'ISM WHEN GIVING SUPERIORITY TO 'ALĪ (A) 549
ZAYD IBN 'ALĪ'S UPRISING AND THE ZAYDĪDS IN SHI'ISM 557
ZAYD IBN 'ALĪ IN KŪFA 560
ZAYD IBN 'ALĪ'S CLASH WITH THE UMAYYADS' FORCES 566
ZAYDISM, SHI'ISM AND ZAYD IBN 'ALĪ (A) 571
THE TWELVE-IMĀM SHI'ITE MUSLIMS AND ZAYD..... 579
YAḤYĀ IBN ZAYD'S UPRISING 590
'ABD ALLĀH IBN MU'ĀWIYA'S UPRISING..... 593
THE SHI'ITE MUSLIMS AND THE 'ALAWITES' LAST POSITION IN THE UMAYYADS'S TIME..... 597

CHAPTER XII

DECLINE OF THE MARWĀNIDS 601
ḤĀRITH IBN SURAYDJ IN KHURĀSĀN..... 601
THE MURDJI'ITES AND THE DJAHMITES IN ḤĀRITH'S UPRISING 605
WALĪD IBN YAZĪD'S CALIPHATE AND EXTREME CORRUPTION OF THE UMAYYADS..... 607
THE IMPACTS OF WALiD'S DEATH ON THE UMAYYADS AND THEIR FALL 614
MARWĀN IBN MUḤAMMAD AND THE DECLINE OF THE UMAYYADS 616
POLITICAL VIEWS OF THE MARWĀNIDS..... 619
SCHOLARS SERVE ĀL MARWĀN..... 632
CIRCULATION OF ISRAELITES AND THE PREVALENCE OF STORY-TELLING 636
CONQUESTS BY THE MARWāNIDS UNTIL LATE FIRST CENTURY 642
ORIENTAL CONQUESTS 642
OCCIDENTAL CONQUESTS..... 646
REFERENCES 649

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

History of Caliphs manifests undeniable facts associated with History of Shiism, the facts every Shiite Muslim and those after Shiism find helpful to achieve on understanding of History of Islam. To this aim, the book is mainly written by the author and printed by the publisher, not to mention the translator, knowing that the task in its entirety is a heavy one with a grave responsibility shouldered upon. Certainly, there exists a mission and function before the Almighty God, his Messenger(s), his progeny and the Shiite followers after, part of which is encumbered here in this historically authentic publication. Motives behind the task are legion and great but whatsoever they may be, they lead every Ahl-e Bayt enthusiast to a long road with unending eternality.

Thanks to divine contributions first, accomplishment of such a heavy task, translation, needs plenty of time, energy, patience, knowledge, faith and aim without each one of which delivery and feasibility seemed improbable. It took a good deal of energy and time excluding other factors to bring this to an end but one thing drove me ahead and that was assistance granted by my Lord who removed all hindrances and obscurities and facilitated the task.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that knowledge, competence and performance are the divine blessings bestowed upon me to fulfil this mammoth task. Be it that the Muslim world and the ensuing generations greatly benefit and transfer it to others.

Diacritics applied in the book for the names come from the latest sources as to the encyclopedia. Any descrepancies shall come under the responsibility of the author of the book.

A. Ebrahimi

Translator

CHAPTER VI
MU'ĀWIYA'S MONARCHY

MU'ĀWIYA, THE FOUNDER OF THE UMAYYAD MONARCHY

Upon seizure of Iraq, center of government since 36, all Islamic territories came under the yoke of Mu'āwiya, who took power thirty years after the Prophet's demise.

Before becoming a caliph, he governed Damascus and the Greater Syria for roughly twenty years. The Umayyads martially leading the Quraysh in Dark Age, stood against Islam as far as possible and they embraced Islam only when they had no way but this. Not only through their behavior but also by knowing about Abū Sufyān and Mu'āwiya, in particular, Imām 'Alī's statement shall be acknowledged as to the fact that they embraced Islam only because of interests.[1] Zubayr also thought of Abū Sufyān in the same way.[2] Yazīd Ibn Abū Sufyān commanded the troops when conquering. Greater Syria and Abū Bakr granted Mu'āwiya sainthood besides his brother.[3]

After Yazīd died, Mu'āwiya was designated as the ruler of Damascus in 'Umar's tenure. As mentioned before, 'Umar's rigorlessness to Mu'āwiya had astonished a number of people.[4] According to Ibn 'Asākir, 'Umar entrusted Damascus thoroughly to Mu'āwiya[5] and by the same token, Mu'āwiya affirmed that by Almighty Allāh he could accomplish to

---

[1]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XX, pp.298-299; Nahdj al-balāgha, letter 454 of 'Alī to Mu'āwiya; concerning Mu'āwiya's ignoring insult of one Jew towards one Muslim; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.160

[2]. al-Aghānī, vol.VI, p.355; some time Abū Sufyān, at the Ḥamza's grave, said, "God bless thee."; You fought us over something that came under control; al-Amtā' wa l-Mu'ānisa, vol.II, p.75

[3]. Rasā'il al-Djāḥiz, al-Rasā'il al-siyāsiya, p.344

[4]. Tathbīt Dalā'il al-nubuwwa, p.593. Ḥasan Baṣrī has said, لقد تصنّع معاويه للخلافة في ولاية عمر بن خطاب Mu'āwiya had been preparing Himself for caliphate since 'Umar's tenure Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.XXV, p.24

[5]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.XXV, pp.17,18,20; Rasā'il al-Djāḥiz, al-Rasā'il al-siyāsiya, p.344

dominate over people merely through his high esteem by 'Umar.[1] Once encountering Mu'āwiya going and accompanied majestically by his retinue, 'Umar asked about the ground. Mu'āwiya responded that the more the enemy spies multiply, the more our grandeur has to heighten; yet, I will abide by what you command.

"By no means do I enjoin him nor prohibit him", said 'Umar.[2]

Mu'āwiya himself deemed his firm standing as consequence of 'Umar's way of behaving towards him.[3] Reacting against objections to Mu'āwiya, 'Uthmān said that how he was ever able to depose him designated by 'Umar.

Nevertheless, Imām 'Alī's response to him in this respect was, "Although Mu'āwiya held 'Umar in reverence, he now does perform whatever without taking counsel with you".[4]

What 'Umar frequently stated was, "You are naming Kasrā (title of Sassanian kings) and Caesar whereas Mu'āwiya is amongst you."[5]

Succeeding 'Uthmān's assassination, in his remarks addressing people, Mu'āwiya announced that he has been the caliph of 'Umar as well as 'Uthmān amongst them.[6] In 'Uthmān's tenure Damascus was regarded as his security zone. He did banish Kūfa reciters along with Abūdhar there.[7] Mu'āwiya did expel them from Damascus soley owing to retaining his position and likewise avoiding their influence on nation. Damascus has been trained by Mu'āwiya and in the course of the Umayya's governorship the in-depth devotion of its dwellers to them clearly manifested the fact.

---

[1]. Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.IX, p.161

[2]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.I, p.15, vol.V, p.114; Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.XXV, p.18; once Mu'āwīya was complained at the presence of 'Umar. 'Umar said, "Leave us away from reproaching Quraysh's young man and his son of the prophet's descendant. Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.XXV, p.18. This is most likely to be attributed to 'Umar

[3]. al-Ghadīr, vol.IX, p.35. From Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, pp.88,90. Djāḥiẓ said, "One of the most significant reasons of the Sufyānids for substantiating Mu'āwīya's caliphate was his own statement. He stated, "This is a position thereto 'Umar has designated me. Never did he depose me since he designated me whereas he designated no emir unless he deposed him or at least he was incensed by his actions and summoned him. Neither did he depose me nor was incensed. He did consign Damascus thoroughly to me and succeeding him. 'Uthmān did reinforce me; Rasā'il al-Djāḥiẓ, al-Rasā'il al-siyāsiya, p.385

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.550

[5]. al-Fakhrī, p.77, Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, Vol.XXV, p.30

[6]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn. P.32; Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol. XXV, p.30.

[7]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.IV, p.229; al-Ghadīr, vol.VI, p.304; vol.IX, p.373

It is quoted that the Umayya rulers have attested in the presence of "Saffāḥ" that they considered no relative for the Holy Prophet (s) save the Umayya.[1]

Mu'āwiya has been quoted as stating,[2] نحن شجرة رسول الله (ص) "We are from the lineage of Allāh's Apostle."

Furthermore, under the guises of the revelation amanuensis and Khāl al-Mu'minīn (the uncle of the faithful) he did strive in order to fortify his religious stance. He compelled a number of hadith (tradition) narrators as well to fabricate tens of hadiths concerning his supremacy and disseminate them among people.[3]

Mu'āwiya's rule was the one and the only experience of a ruler who flourished to secure the sovereignty by employing coercion as well as devising political stratagems vis-a-vis all prevailing political-religious or perhaps tribal and regional disputes. Until then neither a military expedition had been occurred, nor had duress been officially manipulated in order to obtain the political authority. And now how can it be ever justified whereas the rule was thoroughly established by force? It should be borne in mind that this very fact had to be endorsed like other political facts emerging at the beginning of caliphate term that afterwards did turn legitimately into a governmental theory. In order to secure allegiance, when a sovereign could suppress all the dissenters through his political authority, Djamā'a (congregation) has subsequently appeared. What dilemma was now there for those who stressed the concept of community and said that they would be the last ones swearing an oath of allegiance? Under the pretext of the self of Community, they, heedless of how the ruler has secured the authority, swore allegiance to a caliph with whom all were agreed. Mu'āwiya himself declared that he had secured the caliphate neither through nation's amity, nor with their gratification but by sword.[4] Mu'āwiya named that year as "the

---

[1]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.33; al-Nizā' wa l-takhāṣum, p. 28

[2]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.XI, p.87; It has been narrated that there were some in Damascus saying; "If Mu'āwīya is not a prophet, he is at least half of a prophet"; See also Bahdjat al-madjālis, vol.I, p.550. And once one of his devotees met him, he, as a salutation, addressed him, "O Allāh's Messenger!" See also al-Awā'il, Tustarī, p.163; Regarding the person who cursed 'Alī in front of Mu'āwīya, Aḥnaf Ibn Qays asserted, "By Allāh if he knew your gratification was in cursing all the prophets, he would certainly do so."; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.IV, p.113

[3]. As an instance, it has been quoted from the Holy prophet as stating, والأمناء عندالله ثلاثة, جبرئيل وأنا ومعاويه "In sight of Allāh the trustees are three, Djibri'il (Gabriel), Mu'āwiya and me" Such narations have been discussed in detail by Ibn 'Asākir; Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.XXV, pp. 5-16

[4]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.IV, p.81

year of Djamā'a". Touching upon that Mu'āwiya not only secured the authority that year, but also he held sway over other members of the Shuwrā (council), Muhādjirūns and Anṣārs, Djāḥiẓ has stated, "Mu'āwiya named that year as عام الجماعة "The year of Community" whereas that year was, عام فُرقة وقهر وجبر وغلبة "The year of separation, wrath, constraint and predominance."

The year therein Imamate turned into monarchism and Kasrā system and caliphate became usurped and Caesarean.[1] Afterwards, the principle of "Sovereignty does belong to the one who suppress others" turned an incontrovertible principle in political Fiqh (religious jurisprudence) of Sunnism.

Since the inception of his revolt against Imām 'Alī (a), Mu'āwiya's legal mainstay has been his recourse to his kinship with 'Uthmān in addition to his self-introduction as his next of kin. He alleged that the assassin of 'Uthmān had been 'Alī (a) and he as his next of kin would retaliate his assassins. And gradually it turned into hereditary transfer of caliphate from 'Uthmān to Mu'āwiya in the view of Damascus dwellers, for materializing which Mu'āwiya himself played a pivotal role. Prior to this, it should be taken into consideration that Mu'āwiya deemed himself the successor of Qurayshī power which had transferred from Abū Bakr and 'Umar to 'Uthmān. We earlier referred to Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr's letter to Mu'āwiya therein the former had reproached him for his insistence on inequity about 'Alī (a).

As its response, Mu'āwiya wrote, "Your father and I during our prophet's lifetime had held 'Alī's right incontestable and had indeed discerned his supremacy; nevertheless, usurping his right, your father and 'Umar, after prophet's departure, were the ever-first ones who summoned him to swear allegiance to them. He did swear allegiance under duress, they two, yet, granted naught as an allotment to him. After those two, 'Uthmān secured the authority. If it were assumed a blunder, your father had blundered for the first time and we were all his accomplices, yet if it were approved, we emulated your father. If you intend to reproach, you had better reproach your father first."[2]

From the beginning of his revolt against 'Uthmān, Mu'āwiya was doing his utmost to exploit him. Once he requested 'Uthmān to proceed to him in Damascus in order to be immune from the dissenters, 'Uthmān rejected however.[3] Later on, when the revolt aggravated, Mu'āwiya found no

---

[1]. Risālat al-Djāḥiẓ fi Banū Umayya, p. 124 in al-Nizā' wa l-takhāṣum

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, Vol.II, pp.393-397; Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.118, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.III, p.188; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.10; Samṭ Nudjūm al-'awālī, vol.II, p.465

[3]. al-kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.III, p.157. Mu'āwīya definitely intended to prepare the ground for his succession through his coming to Damascus

alternative except 'Uthmān's assassination. He could abuse the people's confidence in Damascus in this regard. Mu'āwiya accordingly never aided 'Uthmān until 'Uthmān eventually perceived it when deeply in trouble, hence he wrote a reproving letter to him.[1] Immediately in the wake of 'Uthmān's assassination as well as his wife's escaping to Damascus, Mu'āwiya proposed to her but she declined.[2]

He, in his letters to Imām 'Alī (a), asserted, "Our caliph 'Uthmān is assassinated oppressedly and since Allāh has said, 'When one is murdered oppressedly, we have assigned a power for his guardian', we are more preferable to 'Uthmān and his descendants."[3] Mu'āwiya's stress on 'Uthmān's succession had culminated in an influence on Sunnis' historical-political line of thinking that for two centuries thereafter Kūfa Shi'ite Muslims, other than the Shi'ite Muslims and few Sunnis, imagined that Orthodox Caliphs were merely three and following them the only possible and legitimate caliph was Mu'āwiya. Afterwards, the notion of "Tarbī'" was broached by Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal wherein 'Alī (a) had been introduced the fourth caliph.

Having composed numerous verses of poems as laudation for the Umayya, Farazdaq has manifested in his poetry the assumption that the Umayya regarded themselves as 'Uthmān's heirs apparent. In a poem addressing 'Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwān, he has composed,

تراث عثمان كانوا الاولياء له سربال ملك عليهم غير مسلوب[4]

"They are the custodians of 'Uthmān's inheritance and this royal robe can by no means be divested."

He in another poem addressing Walīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik, has certified that his caliphate has been transferred from 'Uthmān[5] and elsewhere he has composed addressing Yazīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik that the caliphate has been transferred from 'Uthmān to Mu'āwiya and then to him among the Umayya[6],

ورثت ابن حرب وابن مروان والذي به نصـــر الله النبـــي محمـــدا [7]

---

[1]. Being requested for an aid by 'Uthmān, Mu'āwīya along with two others came to Medina and went to 'Uthmān overnight. "Have you brought any helper?", 'Uthmān questioned

[2]. Nathr al-durr, vol.IV, p.62; Balāghāt al-nisā', p.139; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.VI, p.90

[3]. al-Ghārāt, p.70

[4]. Dīwān Farazdaq, Vol.I, p.25

[5]. Ibid, vol.II, p.210

[6]. Dīwān farazdaq, vol.II, p.210

[7]. Ibid, vol.I, p.114

"You are the heir of Ḥarb's son, Marwān's son and the heir of the one with whose assistance Allāh made Muḥammad (s) vanquish (he has probably meant 'Uthmān by the last one)"

And for Walīd Ibn Yazīd he has composed,

ورثوا مشورُهَا لعثمان التي كانت تراث نبينا المتخيّر[1]

"They are the heirs of Shuwrā (the council) which designated 'Uthmān, the Shuwrā which is the inheritance of the Chosen Prophet's caliphate."

Djāḥiẓ has also specified that Mu'āwiya justified his right for caliphate through 'Uthmān's blood.[2]

Mu'āwiya, from the outset of his opposition to 'Alī (a), announced that he did never seek after caliphate but as a matter of fact he had already prepared himself for securing caliphate. At the very starting point of caliphate, Imām 'Alī (a) urged Mu'āwiya's envoy to inform him that under no circumstances was he was contented with his emirate over Damascus, nor would the nation be gratified with it.[3] His inward aim was overt for the majority but seemingly he commenced to delude them. Prior to Djamal war, he wrote to Zubayr that he had secured allegiance from Damacsus people for him and if he accomplished to conquer Iraq, he would definitely encounter no trouble in Damascus. Zubayr became very thrilled at the letter.[4] Irrespective of Zubayr, Mu'āwiya must have elaborated to what way he had acceded for an admissible caliph to be designated. Consequently, he propounded "Muslims' Council" in this respect. Within the letters written to a number of celebrities of Medina from Ṣiffīn, he had referred to this issue already discussed in Ṣiffīn event. Mu'āwiya was determined to absorb one of the political figures of Quraysh mainly from those attending the councilin order to exploit him politically because Imām had censured him for neither of those from Quraysh in Damascus was permitted in the council and their caliphate was unauthorized.[5] In a letter to Imām 'Alī (a) as well, Mu'āwiya did propound the issue of Council.[6] There matters were on no accounts serious on the part of Mu'āwiya.

Reportedly, the dwellers of Damascus at first had sworn allegiance to him as an emir not Amīr al-Mu'minīn (the Commander of the Faithful) but in the wake of 'Alī's martyrdom he pretended to the caliphate, so the nation

---

[1]. Diwān Farazdaq. vol.I, p.336; al-Umawiyyūn wa l-Khilāfa, pp.13-15, other verser are mentioned besides the aforesaid poems.

[2]. Rasā'il al-Djāḥiẓ, al-Rasā'il al-siyāsiyya, pp.345-346

[3]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.28

[4]. A'yān al-shī'a, vol.III, Section 2, p.12

[5]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.58

[6]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.121

did swear allegiance to him as Amīr al-Mu'minīn.[1] Since the inception, he decided to secure allegiance as the one seeking retaliation for 'Uthmān's blood and as the emir coveting not caliphate so that this responsibility would be entrusted to the Council.[2] It is hinted in "Al-Imāma wa al-Sīyāsa" that prior to Ṣiffīn, Mu'āwiya had secured allegiance as an emir.

Mu'āwiya wrote to Ḥimṣ governor to secure allegiance for him in the same way Damascus people had sworn. Affirming that they would certainly not assemble for retaliating 'Uthmān's blood without a caliph, the nobles of Damascus were not convinced to swear allegiance to Mu'āwiya as an emir. As a result, the dwellers of Ḥimṣ were the ever-first ones swearing allegiance to Mu'āwiya as a "caliph". After the spread of the news in Damascus the people thereof did swear allegiance to him as well.[3] It is stated that Ḥadjdjādj Ibn Waṣma had been the first one addressing him as a caliph and being gratified at it.[4]

Procuring caliphate for Mu'āwiya had been confronted with another hindrance and it was that he was by no means among the precedented Muslims. He together with his father as well as most members of the family had battledwith Islam and subsequent to his conversion to Islam he was among Ṭulaqā (the captives whom Allāh's Apostle set free after a triumph). It was a contemptuous lable.

Although Mu'āwiya had fulfilled to reinforce his position somewhat in Damascus by introducing himself as "Khāl al-Mu'minīn" and "the revelation amanuensis" as well as relying on 'Umar's[5] and 'Uthmān's assistance, Ḥidjāz and Iraq were both well-acquainted with his nature. Once 'Umar had saud that caliphate did only belong to Badr participants but if neither of them were survived, caliphate would be for Uḥud participants as long as even one were alive, yet, caliphate would neverever be entrusted to Ṭulaqā, nor to their descendants.[6] It is probable that this narration had been ascribed to 'Umar; however, it should have been engraved in Muslims' minds after him. In his remarks in Ṣiffīn, 'Ammār had said that they, the Umayya, had had no background in Islam in order to be entitled to be the guardians of the nation or be abided by.[7] Even 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.161.; Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol. XXV, p.27

[2]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.82

[3]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, Vol.I, p.100

[4]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, pp.78,80

[5]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.IX, p.161

[6]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.III, p.342; Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.25, p.42

[7]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.39

responding Mu'āwiya's letter also wrote, "O Mu'āwiya, what do you have to do with caliphate? You are from Ṭulaqā!"[1]

Enclosing with the letter of 'Umar's son, a number of verses belonging to a poet from among Anṣār were dispatched reading that Mu'āwiya was too minor to converse about the council participants.[2] And once 'Alī (a) reprimanded Mu'āwiya when he expressed his ideas about allotments among Muhādjirūn and Anṣār and told him that such affairs have no pertinence to Ṭulaqā![3]

When Mu'āwiya set out to Medina to assure the opposers of Yazīd's succession to the throne, 'Āyisha dissented and accused him of her brother Muḥammad's murder. She reiterated, "You are from among Ṭulaqā for whom caliphate is interdicted."[4]

This defect was not of significance for Mu'āwiya, however, who had surmounted more formidable hurdles. Not only did he designate himself enforcedly as Muslims' caliph, but he nominated his son, infamous for being a debauchee, for that very rank as well.

The Umayya' rule was also a kind of Qurayshī one; therefore, it was on no accounts distinct from the former ones. This circumstance was perpetuated in the 'Abbāsids dynasty too. Now what merits consideration is to perceive when the prerequisite of being from Quraysh had become one of the indispensable prerequisites for caliphate. We already discussed that the prerequisite of being from Quraysh had never been stipulated among prerequisites of Fiqh for caliphate. Although the Shi'ite Muslims, the Twelvers, had faith in Imamate belonging exclusively and citedly to 'Alī (a) and his descendants, those even believing not in citation never considered the element of being from Quraysh a prerequisite for caliphate. Ḥudhayfa had been quoted subsequent to swearing allegiance to 'Alī(a) as saying that he had would in no way swear allegiance to any Qurayshī after him.[5] This utterance by one of the renowned Companions (disciples) does justify that the prerequisite of being from Quraysh had by no means been treated legitimate and incontrovertable. Nontheless, the Umayya who were the principal substructure of Quraysh with securing the authority, propounded the prerequisite of being from Quraysh in earnest and Hadith-fabricaters began fabricating Hadiths in this respect. It has been quoted from Mu'āwiya

---

[1]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.63

[2]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.64

[3]. Nahdj al-balāgha, letter 28

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p.237

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, Vol.II, p.216

as alleging that this empire and caliphate has been laid amongst Quraysh except whom no other one has the eligibility of a caliph.[1]

Addressing the dwellers of Medina who hesitated to swear allegiance to Yazīd, Rawḥ Ibn Zinbā' belonging to the tribe of Djudhām and from among the devotees of the Umayya in Damascus said, "We are not soliciting you to swear allegiance to the tribes of Lakhm, Djudhām or Kalb, ولكنا ندعوكم الى قريش ومن جعل الله له هذا الأمر واختصّه "We are summoning you toward Quraysh and the one for whom Allāh has uniquely assigned this authority, namely Yazīd Ibn Mu'āwiya."[2]

The counterfeit Hadiths prevailing were plentiful among which were "The one disdaining Quraysh has indeed disdained Allāh".[3] "The formost Imāms for the nation are the ones from Quraysh."[4] It is astonishing that to substantiate their nobleness, they availed themselves of their consanguinity with Allāh's Apostle(s)[5], though they antagonized his close kins.

The Umayya's Quraysh-oriented policy was manifest in Umayya's ruthlessness against Anṣār.

Akhṭal, an Umayya poet, had composed, "Quraysh is the possessor of the entire virtuousness and greatness whereas contemptability is under the turban of Anṣār.[6] Enumerating the grounds for his triumph over 'Alī (a), Mu'āwiya referred to his fine relation with Quraysh.[7]

Mu'tazila has indicted Mu'āwiya for initiating fatalism in the Islamic world.[8] It can be avowed that faith in fatalism in Arab world has had it's

---

[1] al-Fitna wa waq'at al-djamal, p. 109; from: Min dawlat 'Umar ilā dawlat 'Abd al-Malik, p. 109

[2]. al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn, Vol.I, p.300; al-Shuwrā fi l-'Aṣr al-umawī, p.34; Later on, when two Umayya ('Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz with Sulaymān Ibn Hishām) performed their prayers led by one of Khāridjites, an outsider composed,

الم تر انّ الله أظهر دينه وصلّت قريش خلف بكر بن وائل

Not you know Allāh's religion won while Quraysh performed its prayer behind the tribe of Bakr Ibn Wā'il

al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn, vol.I, p.343, vol.II, p.265; Shi'r al-khāridjites, p.208, from Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.VIII, p.365, vol.III, p.137; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, Vol.II, p.1913

[3]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.III, p.318, vol.VI, p95; al-Baṣā'ir wa l-dhakā'ir, p.35

[4]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.VI, p.148

[5]. al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn, vol.II, p.67

[6]. al-Aghānī, vol.XVI, pp.35-36; al-Shi'r wa l-shu'arā', p.302; see: al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn, vol.I, p.63

[7]. al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn, vol.II, p.115

[8]. Ṭabaqāt al-mu'tazila, p.6; Faḍl al-I'tizāl wa Ṭabaqāt al-mu'tazila, p.143, al-Awā'il, Abū Hilāl Askarī, vol.II, p.125

antecedent in Dark Age as those of a number of Christians and the Jews of Ḥidjāz. Also succeeding the emergence of Islam, much or less, a number of people have inflamed the subject of fatalism; on the contrary, the fact is that this belief predominated in the Umayya's tenure and gradually turned into a principle in tribal disputes. Employing this principle on caliphate has been revealed in the well-know utterance ascribed to 'Uthmān. The revolters' insistence was his dethrone but in return 'Uthmān acknowledged that he would never ever remove the robe which Allāh had made him wear.

It was wholly evident that he attributed his caliphate to Allāh whereas it was in reality emanated from 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf's notion. Mu'āwiya did take considerable strides in this regard. Mu'āwiya is quoted as saying, as the entire affairs are under Allāh's control, endeavors are all in vain.[1]

Elsewhere he said, "This caliphate is a decree from among Divine decrees along with a destiny from among Divine destinies."[2]

Reacting to 'Āyisha's dissent from the succession of Yazīd, Mu'āwiya responded, "This affair is a Divine destiny but which no one has any other alternative."[3]

In his famous sermon, Ziyād Ibn Abīh, Mu'āwiya's governor in Baṣra and Kūfa declaimed, "O people, we are all the politicians and the advocates of yours. We govern you with recourse to the power bestowed by Allāh."[4]

In addition, Yazīd in his inaugural sermon, stated that since his father had been a servant from among Allāh's servants, Allāh, magnanimous enough, bestowed him the caliphate. Now He has laid it with him.[5]

In an answer to 'Uthmān's son who objected to Yazīd's succession and said, "It was our father after whom you secured the authority".

Mu'āwiya said, "This sovereignty is what Allāh has granted us."[1]

---

[1]. Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, vol.III, p.529

[2]. Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.IX, p.85 (هذه الخلافة أمر من أمرالله وقضاء من قضاء الله)

[3]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.205, Aswad Ibn Yazīd narrated, he enquired 'Āyisha "Is not it surprising that a man from Ṭulaqā (the released) is disputing with Muḥammad's companions on caliphate?"

"No need to surprise" 'Āyisha replied, It is سلطان الله "a Divine power" that Allāh grants to both debauchees and the righteous; as Pharaoh ruled Egypt for four hundred years; Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.XV, p.42

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p.180, al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn, vol.II, p.49; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol,V, p.220; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.IV; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.III, p.449; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Vol.XVI, p.202; Djamharat Khuṭab al-'arab, vol.II, p.273; al-umawīyyūn wa l-Khilāfa, p.25

[5]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.225; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.226; Ansāb al-Ashrāf, vol.IV, p.299, No.798

To induce Mu'āwiya to introduce his son a caliph, Miskīn Dāramī composed,

بني خـــلفاء الله مهـــلاً فانّما يُبونها الرّحمن حيث يزيد
اذا المنبـــر الغربي خلّاه ربـّه فـــبان امير المؤمنين يزيـــد

"O descendants of Allāh's caliphs, slow down, Allāh will rest the rule anywhere He ordains. When the western pulpit of Damascus voided (when Mu'āwiya passed away), Yazīd would be Amīr al-Mu'minīn."[2]

Eventually we will find out how the caliphate simply denoting the succession of Allāh's Apostle(s) at first, gradually conveyed the sense of Divine caliphate. The cardinal matter in Mu'āwiya's caliphate was that he did abolish the tradition of caliphate and declared monarchism officially in stead. By "officially" what we intend is that prior to that in 'Uthmān's tenure the ground had been paved for monarchism (discussed earlier in the section concerning 'Uthmān). Narrated by Ibn 'Asākir, on hearing the news of 'Uthmān's murder, Thumāma Ibn 'Adī, one of the prophet's disciples, wept and stated that he was among those taking the "Prophetic caliphate" from "Muḥammad's household" and turning it into a despotic monarchy.[3]

Although of 'Uthmān's was murdered, a great number of people dissented him, later on account of the Umayya dominion they acquitted and cleansed 'Uthmān of all those flaws. Nevertheless, they still did somewhat cleave to the principle that Mu'āwiya's dominion equals a termination to caliphate era and a commencement to monarchism. This conversion by no means did make them doubt its legitimacy. As a matter of fact, they justified that legitimacy is something and the perfectness of the rule something else.

Regarding this very conversion, a Hadith is attributed to the Holy prophet (s) as stating, خلافة النبوة ثلاثون سنة.[4] "Prophetic caliphate lasts for thirty years," and elsewhere as, الخلافة ثلاثون عاماً ثم يكن بعد ذلك الملك[5] "Caliphate is for thirty years after which monarchism appears."

These Hadiths do never seem authentic. What should be taken into account is that Mu'āwiya was pleased with using the term of monarchism about himself. Mu'āwiya constantly repeated, أنا اول الملوك "I am the first monarch."

---

[1]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.214

[2]. al-umawiyyūn wa l-Khilafa, p.65. From al-Shi'r wa l-shu'arā', vol.I, p.544; al-Aghānī, vol.20, p.212; Khazānat al-adab, vol.III, p.59; Shi'r Miskīn, p.33

[3]. Ibid, vol.V, p.344

[4]. Ibid, vol V, p.344

[5]. Musnad Aḥmad, vol.IV, p.273; vol.V, p.44,50,404; al-Djāmi' al-Ṣaḥīḥ (Sunan al-Tirmidhī) أنا اول الملوك وآخر خليفه "I am the first monarch and the last caliph;" Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.XXV, p.55; Kitāb al-fitan, No.48

In order to fortify his authority and erase all traces of caliphate, it was possible for him to counterfeit such a Hadith as many other instances have been seen. Ka'b al-Aḥbār one of the admirers of 'Uthmān and Mu'āwiya stated that in the Old Testament he had found Allāh's Apostle(s) as the one who would be born in Mecca, migrate to Ṭāba and whose rule is in Damascus.[1] And this might have made Mu'āwiya think of transmitting the Holy Prophet's pulpit as well as his waking-cane from Medina to Damascus.[2] It is also quoted from Abū Hurayra as stating, الملك في قريش والقضاء في الانصار[3] "Monarchism is for Quraysh but governorship for Anṣār" and الخلافة في قريش والحكم في الانصار[4] "Caliphate is for Quraysh but governorship for Anṣār."

And in another narration, one of those possesing bibles had told to Mu'āwiya that he had noticed his attribute within the Divine Books as the one who would for the first time turn caliphate into monarchism, yet, Allāh is merciful and forgiving after all.[5] The Hadith according to which caliphate would last for thirty years had been narrated by Sufayna who was reportedly one of the prophet's Mawālī (freed slaves).

He affirmed that he had heard from the prophet (s) saying, الخلافة ثلاثون عاما ثم يكون بعد ذلك الملك "Caliphate lasts for thirty years and after which monarchism appears."

Consequently, he reckoned that two years for Abū Bakr, ten years for 'Umar, twelve years for 'Uthmān and six years for 'Alī (a).[6]

However, it is known that Imām's authority did merely lasted for four years and nine months not longer. A further reckoning was narrated by Mas'ūdī as follows, two years, three months and eight days for Abū Bakr, ten years and six months for 'Umar, eleven years, eleven months and thirteen days for 'Uthmān, four years, seven months minus afew days for 'Alī (a) and eight months and ten days for Ḥasan (a) that altogether equals

---

[1]. Sunan al-Dārimī, vol.I, p.6

[2]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.237-238; al-Kāmil fī l-tārikh, vol.III, p.463, 464

[3]. Ibid, vol.IV, p.346

[4]. Musnad Aḥmad, vol.IV, p.185

[5]. al-Kāmil fi l-lughat wa l-adab, vol.II, p.191

[6]. Musnad Aḥmad, vol.V, p.220,221; Tirmidhī has narrated the aforegoing quotation from Sa'īd Ibn Djamhān quoted from "Sufayna";

He quoted from Sa'īd telling Sufayna, "The Umayya is of this opinion that caliphate belongs to them."

"They are lying, they are the kings and from the worst kinds" he answered.

Al-Djāmi' al-Ṣaḥiḥ, vol.IV, p.503; al-Nizā' wa l-takhāṣum, p.70; Tirmidhī has added that the Umayya had claimed that caliphate was lain among them by the Holy Prophet(s)

precisely thirty years.[1] Primarily other Hadiths dealing with caliphate are virtually of this category unless, the conclusive evidence vindicate their authenticity otherwise.

The narration of, ان الخلفاء من قريش الى أن تقوم الساعة[2] "Caliphate does belong to Quraysh until the Day of Judgement" would be of this type as well unless in compliance with our belief it corresponded to Naṣṣ (textual nomination) of Imām 'Alī (a) together with his succeeding Imāms.

Heedless of the origin of the Hadith, the historical evidence indicated the start of a thoroughgoing monarchism within the domain of the Islamic caliphate. The term of monarchism as a substitute for caliphate equates to the existence of despotism which is deemed as one of the fundamental features of the rule. As the completion of the narration of this very Hadith "after thirty years" has come, ثم تكون ملكاً عاضاً جبرية "After which monarchism forcibly appears."[3]

The noticeable instances of which were Kasrā's rule in Iran and those of Caesar's and Heraclitus's in Rome and Damascus. Mu'āwiya was a great enthusiast for the background of Damascus in particular. Muslims were all well acquainted with these two rulers.

In one of his sermons concerning Qāsiṭīn (the oppossers), Imām 'Alī (a) said, "Combat Allāh's foes, those striving to extingish Allāh's light. Battle against the misled wrongdoers, the felons who are neither Qur'ān recitors, nor religious jurisprudents, scholars of paraphrase and those having no background in Islam. I do swear by Almighty Allāh that if they could secure the authority, they would undoubtedly perform what was done by Kasrā and Heraclitus."[4]

'Ammār also regarding Qāsiṭīn said that 'Uthmān's assassination was a pretext to them until, ليكونوا بذلك جبابرة ملوكا[5] "The oppressors became monarchs."

It was the approach that Mu'āwiya had singled out in order to secure the authority and govern an Islamic land. He himself divulged, "By Almighty Allāh I did neverever combat for the sake of performing prayers, observing fast, pilgrimage nor paying Zakāt (poor-rate as prescribed by Islam). You

---

[1]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.429. It merits consideration that those fabricating Hadiths have been trying to be accurate in calculation.

[2]. al-Djāmi' al-Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-fitan, No.49

[3]. Musnad Aḥmad, vol.IV, p.273; Kitāb Muslim, Kitāb al-zuhd, No.4

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.78

[5]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.V, p.39

yourself were acting them all. I did combat to dominate you and although Allāh bestowed it to me, you never contented."[1]

On entering Kūfa he announced that the one swearing not allegiance to him would in no way be secure. He set a three-day respite for allegiance.[2] Quoted from Ibn 'Abd al-Barr and Djāḥiẓ, he did secure allegiance from the nation as loathing for 'Alī (a).[3]

In a letter to 'Abd Allāh Ibn Dja'far to swear allegiance to Yazīd, he had written, "If you swear allegiance, you will be adored; otherwised, you will be coerced."[4]

Allegedly, he had ordered to slay the one who avoids swearing.[5] About figures like Qays Ibn Sa'd, having a kind of influence, he secured allegiance by clasping his hand and compelling him to pat his hand whereas Qays was refraining.[6]

Mu'āwiya's aristocratic lifestyle and his procedures adopted in caliphate, pompted Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ as well to address him a "monarch" when meeting.[7] In Damascus he was determined to find the works created about ruler's biographies in Damascus.[8] Later on, Djāḥiẓ recorded that Mu'āwiya turned the rule into the rule of Kasrā and Caesar.[9] Historians have also introduced him as the ever-first monarch.[10] And Sa'īd Ibn Musayyib affirmed that Mu'āwiya was the first one converting caliphate into monarchism.[11] Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba described Mu'āwiya as an emir and specified that there should be a difference between a peasant and an emir.[12] Reportedly, the first one who substituted, ملك يوم الدين "Master of the Day of

---

[1]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.16,46; Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.XXV, pp.43,45

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.47

[3]. Bahdjat al-madjālis, vol.I, p.99; al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn, vol.II, p.105

[4]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.201

[5]. Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, vol.II, p.441

[6]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XVI, p.48-49

[7]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.VIII, p.210; Tārīkh Ya'qūbī, vol.II,.217; al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.I, p.291

[8]. Muntakhabāt al-tawārīkh li-Dimashq, p.81 quoted from Min dawlat 'Umar ilā dawlat 'abd al-malik, p.146

[9]. Rasā'il al-Djāḥiẓ, Rasā'il al-kalāmiyya, p.241

[10]. Tārīkh Khulafā', pp. 196,203

[11]. Tārīkh Ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.232

[12]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.VI, p.20

Judgment" for مالك يوم الدين "Owner of the Day of Judgment" was Mu'āwiya.[1]

Ya'qūbī has enumerated what he did as indications of monarchism as follows, being seated on a platform and making others sit in a lower position, singling out the best propertys of the people and allotting them all to himself.[2] He commanded to devote whatsoever Iranian kings had possessed in farmlands or anywhere else to him.[3]

Mu'āwiya's status was so conspicuous that 'Umar had named him Kasrā in his tenure.[4] It should be asserted that Mu'āwiya was set to establish a "caliphate of Islamic royalty". He considered himself as a king but described as a caliph concerning old traditions. Making efforts to transport Prophets' pulpit from Medina to Damascus, he intended to fortify his Islamic strength although he could never succeed.[5]

Mawdūdī has itemized a number of characteristics for clarifying the distinction between Mu'āwiya's monarchism and his predecessors' caliphate as follows, first, the way of designating a caliph converted. In spite of his predecessors who never rose up for caliphate, Mu'āwiya in any way exerted to gain the caliphate. As soon as he secured the authority, no one was able to dissent him. Anyone had to swear on oath of allegiance to him.

It was what Mu'āwiya himself had confessed, "I was absolutely aware of nation's discontent with my caliphate; however, I secured it by sword".[6]

It gradually culminated in hereditary caliphate by Mu'āwiya. Secondly, the lifestyle of the caliphs converted. Following the approaches of monarchism of Iran and Rome did commence from Mu'āwiya's tenure on. The third feature is concerned with Bayt al-Māl (public fund). At this juncture, public treasury changed in to the king's and his lineage's personal wealth. No one had the right to reprimand the government for the accounts thereof. Fourthly, it was the termination of freedom of speech. At this period, not a single one had an ability to enjoin the good nor prohibit the evil. This new process began in Mu'āwiya's term after Ḥujr Ibn 'Adī's assassination. Fifthly, it was the end of freedom of judiciary branch. The end of the council-oriented government was the sixth characteristic of a monarchical government. The seventh was the emergence of racial and tribal

---

[1]. Akhbār Iṣbahān, vol.II, p.255

[2]. al-Bad' wa l-tārikh, vol.VI, p.6; Tārikh Ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.232

[3]. Tārikh Ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.233

[4]. al-Iṣāba, vol.III, p.434

[5]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.230-240

[6]. al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.VIII, p.132

prejudices. And also elimination of superiority for law has been deemed as the eighth feature.[1]

Mawdūdī has represented many historical instances for each characteristic.

SHI'ITE MUSLIMS IN MU'ĀWIYA'S TIME

In Mu'āwiya's term, one of the crucial issues was the Shi'ites beliefs amongst a number of people specifically Iraqis. We have already discussed the emergence of Shi'ism. Now we are to evaluate the interactions between Shi'ite Muslims and the Umayya.

Beyond any doubt, Shi'ite Muslims have always been Mu'āwiya's archenemies as the Khāridjites were considered as other foes for him. Nevertheless, the Khāridjites were not of great significance. The universal pessimism on the part of Muslims about them, their oppression as well as their baseless position-taking had resulted in having no support among people. On the contrary, Shi'ite Muslims particularly in Iraq were all endowed with a mighty support like Imām 'Alī (a) and others from Ahl al-Bayt (Prophet's infallible household).

The culture disseminated by Imām 'Alī (a) in Iraq was indeed thoroughly Islamic and although people had to keep silence under Mu'āwiya's compulsion, they were all able to distinguish 'Alī's truthfulness and Mu'āwiya's wrongfulness.

Mu'āwiya and with his agents confronted this process with diverse ways, from reconciliation and gentleness to vast harshness. The latter was wide-ranging especially in Iraq. Creating hatred for 'Alī (a) was one the most critical approach used. Mu'āwiya and other Umayyads succeeding him have persistently been endeavoring to wipe 'Alī (a) off the face of the earth and introduce him as an element, aggressive, bloodthirsty and the like. In Holy Prophet's term and later on in caliphs' terms and his own caliphate especially, Imām 'Alī's life verified his unique glory in both scientific and practical domains. His sermons were narrated chest by chest. The statements regarding his scientific supremacy, the Hadiths quoted from the Holy Prophet (s) concerning his excellence as well as his praiseworthy and extraordinary judgments were all recounted by people to one another in hadith assemblies. These all led to dissemination of that culture among people, the culture which prompted Imām 'Alī's disciples to retain this affection for him even at the cost of their martyrdom. And above all, this culture could naturally perpetuate among Imām 'Alī's descendants, from Prophet's household. Inasmuch as the Umayya had perceived this fact, they

---

[1]. Khilāfat wa mulūkiyyat, pp. 118-207

consequently were determined to stigmatize the Imām, express their disgust for him in every assembly and curse him. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd has written a chapter entitled "the hadiths counterfeited by Mu'āwiya concerning 'Alī (a) through stimulating a number of disciples and Tābi'īn" in his book.[1]

When Marwān Ibn Ḥakam was asked why they were doing so, he responded, لا يستقيم لنا الامر الا بذلك[2] "Our governorship will on no accounts be abiding but through this way."

Principally, the Umayya's sovereignty could never perpetuate except the policy of insulting 'Alī (a). Cursing His Excellency, highlighting other caliphs as well as introducing them as superior to 'Alī (a) were constantly pursued. As stated by some, since Hadith-fabricators aimed to approach the Umayya with recourse to these Hadiths, most Hadiths concerned with disciples' virtues had been fabricated in the Umayya's tenure.[3] At this juncture, individuals like 'Āyisha were introduced as a source for Hadiths[4] and others like Zayd Ibn Thābit, being on 'Uthmān's side, were appointed to be the source of advice on legal or religious matters for Mu'āwiya.[5] Attributing Hadiths by Imām 'Alī (a) to himself or others was among what Mu'āwiya did so that others could at times attribute them to Mu'āwiya as well. Djāḥiz who had realized the fact denied the attribution of such Hadiths to Mu'āwiya owing to the fact that he had no relation with the devout.[6]

This Hadith narrated by Imām, ما رأيت سرفاً الا الي جانبها حق مضيّع[7] "I have seen no lavishment unless someone's right was disregarded therein" was ascribed to Mu'āwiya.

In another case, one of Imām's Hadiths was attributed to a Bedouin.[8] "We ascribe 'Alī's letter to Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr to Abū Bakr", Mu'āwiya himself had confessed.[9]

'Alī's malediction to the Kūfiyāns was attributed to 'Umar.[10]

---

1. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.IV, p.63
2. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.I, p.184
3. Fadjr al-islām, p.213
4. al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn, vol.II, p.303
5. al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.X, p. 267
6. al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn, vol.II, p.61
7. Tārīkh Khulafā', p.247
8. Madjma' al-amthāl, vol.I, p.651
9. al-Ghārāt, vol.I, p.251
10. al-Bad' wa l-tārīkh, vol.VI, pp.27-28

Insulting and cursing 'Alī was prolonged as a tradition until it was ceased in 'Umar 'Abd al-'Azīz's time.[1] Mu'āwiya himself stressed that it must be spread to the extent that the offspring mature with this slogan, the youths grow old and no one narrates his excellence.[2] From among the disciples, some contributed to Mu'āwiya in this regard. There existed a Hadith by Abū Hurayra concerning the mischief-making among the nation that says it is about 'Alī, yet, the Holy Prophet (s) has cursed such a person.[3] It has also been narrated that Mu'āwiya rewarded Samura Ibn Djundab with 400,000 dhms to alege that the following verse had been revealed about 'Alī (a),

وَمِنْ النَّاسِ مَنْ يُعْجِبُكَ قَوْلُهُ فِي الْحَيَاةِ الدُّنْيَا وَيُشْهِدُ اللَّهَ عَلَى مَا فِي قَلْبِهِ وَهُوَ أَلَدُّ الْخِصَامِ.

"And among men is the one whose speech about this worldly life causes you to wonder, and he calls on Allāh to witness as to what is in his heart, yet he is the most violent of adversaries."[4]

Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd has written that Mu'āwiya had stimulated a number of disciples to narrate some Hadiths against Imām 'Alī(a) among whom were Abū Hurayra, 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ, Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba and 'Urwa Ibn Zubayr.[5]

In his letters to his agents in cities, Mu'āwiya wrote, "The Hadiths regarding 'Uthmān's virtues are being augmented in cities, as soon as you received my letter, urge people to begin narrating the excellences of companions and caliphs and also narrate a Hadith contradicting any Hadith narrated concerning Abū Turāb's (Imām 'Alī) virtues."

Accordng to Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, most of them in order to get closer to the Umayya fabricated Hadiths expressing disciples' excellences.[6] To replace the Hadith about the brotherhood between 'Alī(a) and the Holy Prophet (s), they counterfeited it therein the Prophet(s) stated, "If I intended to designate a successor for myself, he would undoubtedly be Abū Bakr."

They had fabricated the hadith of "Khawkha" opposite to Hadith of "Sadd al-Abwāb".[7]

---

[1]. Tārikh Khulafā', p.243

[2]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.IV, p.57; al-Naṣā'iḥ al-kāfiya, p.72

[3]. al-Īḍāḥ, pp.210-211; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.IV, p.63 It is probable that this Hadith is attributed to Abū Hurayra and he Himself has not narrated it.

[4]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd,vol.I, p.361 (the four-volume edition)

[5]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd,vol.I, p.63

[6]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XI, p.44

[7]. Ibid, vol.XI, p.49

Mu'āwiya was extremely bound to curse Imām 'Alī (a) as the conclusion of his sermons.[1] He even compelled Imām's disciples to go up the pulpit and curse him.[2] Any agent of Mu'āwiya who did not abide by the tradition of cursing was deposed and replaced right away.[3] He had eaniced people into daring not to name their babies 'Alī[4] but call them Mu'āwiya instead.[5]

He had announced that if anyone narrated the excellences of 'Alī, he would never warrant his security. Subsequently all preachers expressed their disgust for Imām 'Alī (a) and cursed him.[6] However, in return he commanded his agents to support the one narrating 'Uthmān's excellences.[7] A great number also lived either in Damascus or Iraq who loathed Imām 'Alī (a) for their kins' murder. And now the opportunity was provided to them to disclose their rancor by insulting and cursing him. When Ḥarīz Ibn 'Uthmān was asked why he cursed Imām (a) seventy times every morning and night, his response was, "How can I abstain from it whereas he has beheaded my forefathers with suspicion."[8]

We will discuss later that the pressure exercising on Ahl al-Bayt was wholly for the sake of hindering 'Alī's name to be commemorated. As one of the reasons for murdering Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī(a) by poison, Ibn Djawzī has pointed to his entry into Damascus[9] which was naturally intolerable. All of these harsh treatments in order to wipe 'Alī's name off the face of the earth occasioned people not to have the courage to narrate 'Alī's virtues. Awzā'ī, a renowned traditionist, did narrate nothing concerned with Ahl al-Bayt's virtues save the Hadith to inform the revelation of the verse of "Taṭhīr" (purification) about them[10], the same as Zuhrī who narrated not more than a virtue.[11] It seemed quite natural that all these repeated and universal curses could eventually influence people's hearts, particularly in Ḥidjāz and Damascus, and gradually change public opinions. It was, in every respect, what Mu'āwiya sought. Because Islamic leadership lay with Imām 'Alī,

---

1. Ibid, vol.IV, pp. 56-57

2. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.II, p.298; Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, pp.66,101-102; Ma'rifat saḥāba, vol.II, p. 236

3. Turāthunā, No.10, pp.143-144

4. Shadhārāt al-dhahab, vol.I, p.148

5. Concerning Mu'āwīya Ibn 'Abd Allāh Ibn Dja'far; Ansāb al-ashrāf, section 4

6. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XI, p.44; Biḥār, vol.IV, p.125

7. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.I, p.184

8. al-Madjrūḥīn, vol.I, p.268

9. Tadhkirat al-khawāṣ, Ibn Sa'd, p.212

10. Usd al-ghāba, vol.II, p.20

11. Ibid.

eliminating him could lead to elimination of the religion from the society. As an emphasis, Mu'āwiya secured allegiance from people by prerequisite of loathing 'Alī (a)[1] in the same mannar that he had forced them for the first time to swear.[2]

Mu'āwiya's another action facing Shi'ite Muslims was excercising compulsion. The manifestation of his rancor to Imām and Shi'ite Muslims was in his brutal treatments. Imām Ḥasan Mudjtabā's martyrdom, a conspiracy by Mu'āwiya, was in line with this very policy. It is what historical sources have reported and accordingly, they have in truth discredited Mu'āwiya among Muslims. The opposition of Umm al-Mu'minīn (mother of the faithful, 'Āyisha) in Imām's burial beside the Prophet (s) exhibited the immense oppressedness of Imām together with his Shi'ite Muslims.[3] Mu'āwiya who believed that it was not feasible to delude the people of Iraq in the same way as silly people of Damascus, he had to choose the route of slaying and chastizing. Besides, Iraqi dwellers, including both Shi'ite Muslims and non-Shi'ite Muslims, were so sensitive that even a slight irritation could result in chanting bitter slogans against the Umayya although they were all obedient under the sword of Ziyād and Ḥadjdjādj. The common term describing Shi'ite Muslims was "Turābiyya" in the Umayya's tenure.[4] It was derived from "Abū Turāb", (the father of soil), the title use by the Umayya for scorning Imām 'Alī (a); nevertheless, later on a number of "Ghulāt" (the Exaggerators) availed themselves of it for proving the Divinity of Imām 'Alī.

Slaying Shi'ite Muslims had begun since Imām 'Alī's term. After Imām's forces dispersed and there was no security found but in Iraq, Mu'āwiya deployed his troops along with some envoys to various areas among whom were Busr Ibn Arṭāt, Sufyān Ibn 'Awf Ghāmidī and Ḍahhāk Ibn Qays. Their responsibility in cities was to trace and, فيقتلوا كل من وجده من شيعة علي "Kill any Shi'ites they noticed at Mu'āwiya's behest."

Busr set out to Medina were he martyred many of 'Alī's disciples and enthusiasts and demolished their houses as well. He then went to Mecca and Sarāt respectively and slayed any Shi'ite Muslim he discovered. Ultimately, he left there for Nadjrān and martyred 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abd al-Muddān as well as his son. Earlier we presented a profile of his crimes.

Among areas that Busr passed en route and plundered was an area the residents of which were from the tribe of Hamdān, 'Alī's Shi'ite Muslims.

---

[1]. Bahdjat al-madjālis, vol.I, p.99; al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn, vol.II, p.105

[2]. Ibid, vol.I, p.550

[3]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.V, p.115

[4]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, p.184

Ambushing them, Busr killed numerous men and captured a number of women and children. For the ever-first time Muslim women and children were captured.[1] These measures were once again adopted later in Karbalā. About Busr, Mas'ūdī has written that he slayed a number from the tribes of Khuzā'a and Hamdān together with a group known as al-Abnā' (from Iranian race) in Yemen. ولم يبلغه عن أحد انه يمالي علياً او يهواه الا قتله[2] "He killed anyone of whose attachment to 'Alī he heard."

Setting out to Anbār, 'Awf Ibn Sufyān martyred Ibn Ḥassān al-Bakrī in addition to Shi'ites men and women.[3]

After Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī (a) had to compromise with Mu'āwiya, one of the menaces Imām felt was the security of 'Alī's Shi'ite Muslims. Hence it was stipulated within the contract that 'Alī's disciples should be all endowed with security. Although Mu'āwiya had conceded it, immediately on the same day he announced that he would disregard the entire commitments.

Since Kūfa was the center of Shi'ite Muslims' political and religious tendencies, Mu'āwiya had to appoint one who can curb such people. Following the clashes between 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ and Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba who could keep up with Mu'āwiya in deception, Mughīra eventually flourished to be appointed as the governor of Kūfa.

Mu'āwiya's endeavor was to have politically peaceful treatments towards the opponents as much as he could. The bases of two groups of the Umayya adversaries such as the Khāridjites and Shi'ite Muslims were in Iraq. The Khāridjites revolted several times but were suppressed with all possible haste. But on the other hand, Shi'ite Muslims by virtue of the contract signed between Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī and Mu'āwiya, did not permit themselves to transgress. Mughīra also intended to take no action except against the one revolting. As a result, even the Khāridjites of Kūfa also had apparent relations with one another.[4]

Among the Iraqi tribes, the tribes of Rabi'a, Hamdān[5], Banū 'Abd al-Qays and Khuzā'a (few in Iraq) had Shi'ites inclination.

In his remarks addressing the tribe of Banū 'Abd al-Qays, Ṣa'ṣa'a Ibn Ṣūḥān said, "When apostasy was common, you did remain beside the religion and when some followed 'Āyisha, Ṭalḥa, Zubayr and 'Abd Allāh

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, vol.V, p.11

[2]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.22

"Busr also was determined to slay anyone who might have had a hand 'Uthmān's assassination" Tārīkh al-ṭabarī has written. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.134

[3]. al-Aghānī, vol.XVI, pp.266, 267

[4]. Ṭārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 132

[5]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.379

Ibn Wahb Rāsibī, you declared that, انا لا نريد إلا أهل البيت الذي ابتدأنا الله من قبلهم بالكرامة[1] "You seek naught save Ahl al-Bayt, at first by whom Allāh had granted you blessing."

Ṣa'ṣa'a under other circumstances availed himself of the opportunities provided for spreading his beliefs which were mostly censuring 'Uthmān and eulogizing 'Alī (a).

When Mughīra was notified of such movements, he summoned Ṣa'ṣa'a and told him, "Far more than you we are acquainted with his excellences but هذه السلطان قد ظهر وأخذنا باظهار عيبه للناس فندع كثيراً مما أمرنا به ونذكر الشيء الذي لانجد منه بداً نرفع به هؤلاء القوم عن أنفسنا تقيّة[2] "Because as soon as this ruler appeared, we had to denounce 'Alī and relinguish many of what we were ordered to merely in order to extricate ourselves from this race (the Umayya)."

Anyhow Mughīra the same as other agents were compelled to denounce Imām 'Alī (a) and exonerate 'Uthmān. Owing to this fact يتعرّض لعليٍّ في مجلسه وخطبه ويدعو لعثمان ويترحّم له[3] "He variably denounced 'Alī (a) in every assembly and sermon in the mosque but commemorated 'Uthmān and pled mercy for him."

Subsquent to Mughīra's death (probably in 49 or 50 A.H.) the status quo converted. Although Ziyād Ibn Abīh was the governor of Baṣra at that time, Mu'āwiya added Kūfa to this realm as well. At the time of Imām 'Alī (a), Ziyād Ibn Abīh was the governor of Fārs. Since Mu'āwiya's intention was deluding 'Alī's disciples, he decided to delude Ziyād too. His defect was lacking a definite begetter that Mu'āwiya solved the problem by naming him Ziyād Ibn Abī Sufyān. Despite Imām 'Alī's forewarning to him[4], Ziyād did never resent it and ultimately a while after of compromising he took refuge in Mu'āwiya's side.

Ziyād as well as his toughness were quite well known to Mu'āwiya. He also knew that Ziyād had been in Iraq for some time and knew 'Alī's Shi'ite Muslims all well. Accordingly, first he despatched him to Baṣra and added Kūfa to his realm after Mughīra's death. Mu'āwiya might realize that the Shi'ite Muslims in Kūfa enjoyed relative freedom and at times could openly object in presence of Mughīra in the mosque. It was considered a real threat which Mu'āwiya removed by Ziyād's dispatch.

The first measure taken by Ziyād was cutting off the hands of those (nearly eighty) who were not convinced to swear allegiance to him.[5] Ziyād's

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-dhahab, vol.II, p.379

[2]. Tārīkh al-dhahab, vol.IV, p.144

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.188; Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn, vol.III, pp.10,11

[4]. Rabī' al-abrār, vol.III. p.559

[5]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.III, p.462

harsh treatment in Baṣra, with a group of the Khāridjites in addition to Shi'ite Muslims, was proverbial. He had declared a kind of martial law in Baṣra. At nights, following the night prayer, the opportunity people had for staying outdoors was as long as reciting the Sūra (chapter) of The Cow. During the curfew, Ziyād's soldiers slayed anyone they traced.[1] Historians have introduced Ziyād as the ever-first one who drew his sword to people, arrested them by accusing them and chastized them with suspicion.[2] Among the Shi'ite Muslims martyred by Ziyād were Muslim Ibn Zaymur and 'Abd Allāh Ibn Nudjā who were both from the tribe of Ḥaḍram. In a letter to Mu'āwiya succeeding Ḥudjr's martyrdom, Imām Ḥusayn (a) had commemorated their martyrdom too.[3]

Ziyād's main mission was to suppress the Shi'ite Muslims of Kūfa throughout Iraq.

"He was always seeking after Shi'ite Muslims and anywhere tracing he slayed them", Ibn A'tham said.

He cut off the limbs of people and blinded them. Mu'āwiya himself murdered a great number as well.[4] Elsewhere it has been written that Mu'āwiya had issued the verdict of executing a group of Shi'ite Muslims.[5] Ziyād assembled Shi'ite Muslims in a mosque in order to make them express loathing for 'Alī.[6] He also searched for Shi'ite Muslims in Baṣra to kill.[7] In a letter Imām Ḥasan (a) objected to Mu'āwiya in this regard.[8] Treating the same way, Samura Ibn Djundab, a substitute for him in Baṣra, had allegedly augmented the number of orphans in Baṣra and massacred nearly 8000 people until Ziyād objected him.[9] Although the accuracy of the abovementioned figures is not definite, it manifests a profile of their atrocities. Ziyād's treatment towards 'Alī's friends was unjust, in a real

---

[1]. Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn, vol.III, p.8; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.III, p.450

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p.174; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.167; Ibn Khaldūn, vol.III, p.18; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.III, p.450

[3]. al-Muḥabbar, p.479, Muḥammad Ibn Ḥabīb has written, "Ziyād Ibn Abīh executed MuslimM Ibn Zaymur and 'Abd Allāh Ibn Nudjā, both Shi'ite Muslims, at the doors of their houses at Mu'āwiya's behest.

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p.203; see also Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XI, p.44

[5]. al-Muḥabbar, p.479

[6]. MukhtaṣarTārīkh Dimashq, vol.IX, p.88

[7]. Ibid, p.88

[8]. MukhtaṣarTārīkh Dimashq, vol.IX, p.86

[9]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.176, Ibn Khaldūn, vol.III, p.10; see also Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.217; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.III, p.462

sense[1] exactly the same as that of 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Āmir, Mu'āwiya's another governor.[2] Nu'mān Ibn Bashīr, ex-governor of this area, on account of his acute rancor to dwellers of Kūfa did not even want to obey Mu'āwiya's order to increase their provisions from Bayt al-Māl (public fund).[3]

Under the guise of a peace-seeking character, Mu'āwiya had commanded Ziyād to decimate anyone at 'Alī's religion.[4]

"Kill anyone amongst you who is from 'Alī's Shi'ite Muslims or accused of his amity", he wrote to his agents, "and for it find evidence even hidden under the rocks even though it was solely an assumption".[5] "Exclude the name of the one for whose amity to 'Alī you found any proof from Bayt al-Māl", he added, "and discontinue his provision."

He then wrote in conclusion, من اتّهمتموه بموالاة هولاء القوم فنكّلوا به واهدموا داره[6] "Kill any one from among yourselves who is accused of having devotion to 'Alī and demolish his house as well."

Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd has also written that as far as Ziyād was well-aquainted with Shi'ite Muslims, قتلهم تحت كل حجر ومدر وأخافهم وقطع الأيدي والأرجل وسمل العيون وصلبهم على جذوع النخل وطرّدهم وشرّدهم[7] "He massacred them all anywhere whom he noticed, intimidated them, cut off their limbs, blinded them, hung them from tree branches and banished them."

The impetus of such treatments was totally obvious. According to Aḥnaf Ibn Qays, one of the headmen of Banū Tamīm tribe had told about Mu'āwiya that he had captured Iraq not by force but through commitement and contracts;[8] Anytime it was probable for people to revolt against Mu'āwiya or "a catastrophe", as he called it, take place.[9] It was as a result, necessary that any rebellion be suppressed. Dissatisfied with the Umayya's the people of Iraq had to yield to them reluctantly. Imām Ḥasan (a) also had reminded Mu'āwiya of this point.[10] By the same token, as mentioned by

---

1. al-Aghānī, vol.XII, p.312

2. Ibid, pp.317,336

3. al-Aghānī, vol.XVI, pp.29,30

4. Bahdj al-sabāgha, vol.III, pp.179,180; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.IV, p.57; this sentence has authentically come in Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī's letter which will be discussed later.

5. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.150; Bahdj al-sabāgha, vol.III, p.180

6. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XI, p.45; al-Ghadīr, vol.XI, p.29

7. Ibid, vol.XI, pp.44,46

8. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, pp.156,158; Biḥār, vol.XXXXIV, p.108

9. Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXIV, p.104

10. Manāqib Ibn Shahr Āshūb, vol.IV, p.22; Biḥār, vol.XXXXIV, p.104

Djāḥiẓ it was in truth a blunder that Mu'āwiya had named 41 A.H. as عام الجماعة "The year of congregation" on the contrary, it must have been named as, عام التفرقة "The year of separation"[1]

These all accounted for the lack of factual collaboration and even the potential enmity of the Kūfiyāns towards Mu'āwiya. In spite of the compulsion exercised by individuals like Ziyād and deception practised by Mughīra to impede the growth of adversaries, Shi'ite Muslims were still wholeheartedly faithful to their allegiance. Imām 'Alī (a) had recommended them to curse him if they were under duress, but neverever loathe him.[2] Anyhow, Kūfa was like fire under ashes that should have been thwarted with great effort not to catch fire again.

The Suppression of Ḥudjr Ibn 'Adī's Shi'ite Movement

Ḥudjr al-Khayr or Ḥudjr Ibn 'Adī who had been among the Holy Prophet's disciples, did later range himself with 'Alī's firm and devoted Shi'ite Muslims. He belonged to the tribe of Kinda, a southern tribe in Ḥidjāz, who had migrated to Iraq in 17 A.H. This tribe was involved in Iraqi events as participants in Ṣiffīn and later on in Mukhtār's uprising.[3] A crowd from among them was at odds with Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī (a) in Karbalā. In the course of Ṣiffīn, his activity was utterly broad and he played a role as a commander in 'Alī's army, yet when many a bandoned Imām (a)[4], up to the very last moment he stayed beside him.[5] Ḥudjr could be found amid the most pious disciples of Allāh's Apostle(s). Ḥukaym Niyshābūrī called him the monk of Prophet's disciples.[6] After 'Alī's martyrdom, he was amongt the ones stimulating the nation to swear allegiance to Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī (a). In the process of compromising, Ḥudjr seemed discontented but Imām elaborated that he had to consent merely due to protecting the lives of individuals like him.[7] Nontheless later Mu'āwiya by no means remained faithful to his pledge and martyred both Ḥudjr and his followers.[8]

During the governorship of Mughīra over Kūfa that lasted until the beginning of 50s, in spite of relative freedom, insults were still hurled at

---

[1]. Risālat Djāḥiẓ fī Umayya published with al-Nizā' wa l-takhāṣum, Miqrīzī.

[2]. Sharh nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.IV, p.106

[3]. Mu'djam Qabā'il al-'arab, vol.IV, p.999; Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.104

[4]. Ibid

[5]. al-Ghārāt, vol.II, p.481

[6]. A'yān al-shī'a, vol.XX, pp.60,67

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.45

[8]. Ibid, p.47

Imām 'Alī (a) in the masque. The leadership of 'Alī's Shi'ite Muslims was lain with the characters such as Ḥudjr Ibn 'Adī and 'Amr Ibn Ḥamiq Khuzā'ī.[1] Ḥudjr was among those who frequently objected to Mughīra accustomed to insult Imām 'Alī (a). When Mughīra was paved the way to send a caravan carrying some properties to Mu'āwiya who was in need, Ḥudjr intercepted the caravan and declared that as long as he has not granted the rights of the rightful, on no accounts would he allow these properties to be conveyed.[2] At Mu'āwiya's behest, Mughīra had commanded them to take part in the congregational prayer at the mosque.[3]

Once Ḥudjr was urged by Mughīra to go up the pulpit and curse Imām 'Alī (a) he went up and said, "Mughīra propels me to curse 'Alī (a), curse him you all."[4]

Immediately, the congregation perceived that his intention had been Mughīra himself. Mughīra, however, had already declared that he never intended to be the first one murdering the celebrity of Kūfa and as a result contribute to Mu'āwiya's grandeur in this world and his own abjectness in the Hereafter.[5] This statement was the response to those objecting why he did not arrest or harass Ḥudjr.

Following the demise of Mughīra and Ziyād's governorship over Kūfa, the status quo altered perceptibly.

Ziyād, from the very first night of his governorship, did commence his rigors. His exceptional sermon for threatening Kūfa people, has been recorded as a typical Arab sermon in historical sourcesat that juncture.

Well acquainted with Ḥudjr Ibn 'Adī, he warned him stating, "You and I have been in the same situation that you know yourself (concerning 'Alī's amity) but today anything has converted. Hold your tongue and stay at your home. My throne can be yours too. I will doubtlessly meet all your demands provided that you get along with me although you are rash".

Seemingly, Ḥudjr who was convinced went away.[6]

Once again the status quo changed. It is said that one time Ḥudjr interrupted Ziyād's remarks protracted and the time of prayer was elasping, yelling out, "Al-Ṣalāt" (prayer).[7] It is also narrated that he along with other

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.175

[2]. Tahdhīb Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.IV, p.84

[3]. al-Kāmil

[4]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, pp.69,101,102

[5]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.189

[6]. Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā, vol., p.218; al-Aghānī, vol.XVII, p.134, 135

[7]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.190

Shi'ite Muslims had been convening meetings after Ziyād's departure to Baṣra. Ziyād's substitute, 'Amr Ibn Hurayth, wrote to Ziyād that if he desired to maintain Kūfa, he should return without delay.[1]

In this respect, Ḥudjr was not merely solitary, but also he was under any circumstances accompanied by a number of Shi'ite Muslims. Quotedly, when Ḥudjr protested against Mughira in the mosque, more than one- third of the audience validated his remarks.[2] As written by Abu l-Faradj, in the absence of Ziyād, being in Baṣra, Ḥudjr together with his companions occupied one-third or half of the mosque and began denouncing and vilifying Mu'āwiya.[3] Ziyād himself had denounced the nobles of Kūfa that انتم معي وإخوانكم وأبنائكم وعشائركم مع حجر[4] "You are on my side whereas your brothers, offspring and tribes are on Ḥudjr's side."

After a while, a multitude of those on Ḥudjr's side dispersed since the chiefs of tribes had menaced the members of the tribes. Therefore, there was no more companion remained with Ḥudjr.

When a group was sent to arrest him, he addressed his friends as saying, "Since you are by no means able to defy them, there is no way for any struggle.[5] Eventually, Ḥudjr conceded to surrender provided that for drawing deduction he should be taken to meet Mu'āwiya.[6]

Having accepted the condition, Ziyād was making an attempt on the other hand to expose him to murder. By the same token, he compelled four characters having been appointed as the chiefs of the tribes in Kūfa to make an affidavit against Ḥudjr. It was stipulated in the affidavit that Ḥudjr had formed some assemblies wherein Mu'āwiya had been cursed. His belief was that no one merited the caliphate save those from Ṭālib's lineage. As stated by them having caused chaos within the town, he had expelled 'Amr Ibn Ḥurayth, the governor; furthermore, he had not only saluted 'Alī, but expressed his disgust for his foes and those having combated him.

Ziyād who had on no accounts approved the aforesaid affidavit ordered Abū Burda, son of Abū Mūsā Ash'arī, to prepare a more pungent one. What he wrote as a result was, إن حجر خلع الطاعة وفارق الجماعة ولعن الخليفة ودعا إلي الحرب والفتنة وجمع إليه الجموع يدعوهم إلى نكث البيعة وخلع امير المؤمنين معاويه وكفر بالله كفرة صلعاء "Ḥudjr has declined to comply with the caliph and seceded from "Djamā'a". He has

---

[1]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.VI, p.218

[2]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.189; Ibn Khaldūn, vol.IV, p.11

[3]. al-Aghānī, vol.17, p.135

[4]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.191; al-Aghānī, vol.XVII, p.36

[5]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV

[6]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.190; Tārikh Ibn Khaldūn, vol.IV, p.14

cursed the caliph and summoned all to a battle and sedition. Having congregated the people around himself, he has urged them to breach their pledges. He dethroned Mu'āwiya, Amīr al-Mu'minīn, from the caliphate and blasphemed against Allāh in addition."[1]

This time Ḥudjr was labeled a blasphemer. Abū Burda who was one of the eminent Sunnites traditionists bore the witness of it.[2] Ziyād persuaded others to sign it too. Among the signitories were Isḥāq and Moses, sons of Ṭalḥa, Mundhir, Zubayr's son, 'Umar, son of Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ and 'Umāra, son of 'Uqba Ibn Abī Mu'ayṭ.[3]

As narrated by historians, while Ḥudjr was being arrested, he yelled out, "I am still faithful to my allegiance". He was absolutely right because he neverever intended to revolt againt Mu'āwiya. What he insisted on was about 'Alī not to be insulted. And it was precisely what had been stipulated in Mu'āwiya's commitment and conceded by him Fascinatingly, it was specified in the affidavit that Ḥudjr believed that caliphate was well deserved to no one but those from Ṭālib's lineage. It was the manifestation of Ḥudjr's purifiedly Shi'ites belief. "Purified Shi'ite Muslims" denotes those being religious Shi'ite Muslims. The belief of such Shi'ite Muslims is that Imamate does solely belong to prophet's household (Ahl al-Bayt).

In a poem quoted from Ḥudjr we read, "'Alī فإنه كان له وليًا ثم ارتضاه بعده وصيًا was a friend of the prophet's (s) and he was gratified with his executorship."[4]

Ḥudjr described 'Alī as Prophet's friend and executor. At that time many were of this belief in Iraq. When Abu l-Aswad Du'alī was sneered due to his in-depth enthusiasm for 'Alī, he stated in a poem,

أحب محمداً حبًا شديداً وعباساً وحمزة والوصيا[5]

"I adore Muḥammad (s), 'Abbās, Ḥamza and the executor ('Alī)"

He did introduce 'Alī as the Holy Prophet's executor manifestubg his successorship. Corresponding to it is Mālik's statement regarding 'Alī, هذا وصي الأوصياء ووارث علم الأنبياء[6] "The executor of the executors and the inheritor of all prophets' body of knowledge is he."

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp.199,200; al-Ghārāt, vol.II, p.565; al-Kunā wa l-Alqāb, vol.I, p.15; al-Aghānī, vol.17, p.146; Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn, vol.IV, pp.12,13. "Ṣal'ā'" might refer to 'Alī (a) who was well-Known as Aṣla' or might mean "intensely"

[2]. Concerning Abū Barda has come in Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ, vol.I, p.95 as follows انه النقيه احد الأعه الاثبات "He has been one of the eminent Islamic jurisprudent"

[3]. al-Aghānī, vol.XVII, p.146; Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn, vol.IV, pp.12,13

[4]. Waq'at Ṣiffīn, p.381

[5]. al-Aghānī, vol.XII, p.321

[6]. Tārīkh Ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.151

This description was also what Imām Bāqir's Shi'ite Muslims like Djābir Ibn Yazīd Dju'fī uttered about 'Alī (a).[1] Further instances have been presented earlier in discussion of Shi'ism at Imām 'Alī's time.

Ultimately, Ḥudjr along with his fourteen companions, known as the heads of Ḥudjr's followers[2], was sent to Damascus. A few of them were interceded and forgiven by Mu'āwiya in Damascus. Although Ḥudjr also was interceded, Mu'āwiya did in no way accept. Reportedly, Mu'āwiya was at first ambivalent and on this account he had already written to Ziyād that he believed that Ḥudjr should never be murdered but Ziyād had replied that liberating him would result in corruption of Iraq[3], and he could allow Ḥudjr to return Iraq on the condition that he did not require Kūfa.[4]

Mu'āwiya eventually made a decision to assassinate Ḥudjr; notwithstanding, since he was terrified to meet him face to face, he commanded to detain them in Mardj 'Adhrā' a few Farsangs far away from Damascus.[5] Later he read out the affidavit of dwellers of Kūfa to those of Damascus and appealed to them to voice their opinions! It was utterly evident that what they could ever say when the disciples' descendants were of that opinion! Mu'āwiya deployed a number to Mardj 'Adhrā' to carry out what they were supposed to. They were at first duty-bound to propose them that if they expressed their loathing for 'Alī (a), the verdict would be declared null and void. Under no circumstances did Ḥudjr and his companions agree. And it might have been owing to this fact that Imām 'Alī (a) had asserted that after him if they were impelled to insult him, they should abide by but neverever express loathing for him.[6] Subsequently, digging their own graves, Ḥudjr and his companions spent dusk to dawn in worshiping. Eight out of them were set free but six of them announced their readiness for martyrdom.

Next morning they were again requested to express their idea about 'Uthmān, أول من جار في الحكم "The ever-first one who did injustice was 'Uthmān", they retorted. They were asked whether they would pronounce disgust for 'Alī. They responded, لا، بل نتولاه ونتبرأ ممن تبرأ منه "No, never, we do all love him and hate those who hate him."

---

[1]. al-Irshād, p.280

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.199

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, p.204

[4]. Ibid, p.203; al-Aghānī, vol.XVII, p.149

[5]. It is quoted that in conquering Damascus, Ḥudjr Himself had conquered this area; al-Muḥabbar, p. 292 ان حجرا اول من وحد الله عزوجل بمرج عذراء حين افتتحت on conquering Mardj 'Adhra', the first one who glorified Allāh by saying "Allāh Akbar" was Ḥudjr.

[6]. al-Irshād, p.169; Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p.101

Then they prepared themselves for being martyred. Ḥudjr who was prominent among the devout of Iraq said a very-long-two-Rak'at prayer (Rak'at, unit of prayer consisting of three postures) and stated, والله ماصليت قطّ أقصر منها ولولا أن تروا أن ما بي جزع من الموت أحببت أن استكثر منها "As yet, I have never performed a prayer shorter than this and I yearned to prolong it if you did not accuse me of being scared of decease."

Six of them were martyred. Karīm Ibn 'Afīf Khath'amī and 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Ḥassān al-'Anzī were both taken to meet Mu'āwiya. Karīm was interceded but when it was 'Abd al-Raḥmān's turn, Mu'āwiya questioned him about 'Alī (a).

"You had better not enquire any question", he responded.

When Mu'āwiya insisted, he declared, أشهد أنه من الذاكرين الله كثيراً ومن الآمرين بالحق والقائمين بالقسط والعافين عن الناس "I do attest that he was among the ones bearing Allāh invariably in mind, enjoining good, establishing justice and being magnanimous." And when he was asked about 'Uthmān, he replied, هو اوّل من فتح باب الظلم وارتجع ابواب الحق "He was the first one who opened the door of injustice and closed the doors of justice."

Mu'āwiya sent him to Iraq and instructed Ziyād to kill him brutally. Then, he was buried alive at Ziyād's behest.[1]

Repercussions of Ḥudjr's Martyrdom

Ḥudjr's martyrdom did mar the reputation of Mu'āwiya as well as other Umayyads incredibly. As far as his fame for devoutness and worship among the Prophet's disciples was concerned, rarely could anyone be found unacquainted with his piety. Being among the chiefs of the tribe of Kinda had magnified his eminence too. Therefore, eruption of objections against the Umayya in general and Mu'āwiya in particular seemed quite natural. Although the heavy pressure exerted could impede the occurance of probable riots in Iraq, it could on the contrary intensify the nation's devotion to Shi'ism on the one hand and their rancor to Mu'āwiya on the other hand. Later, a multitude including Ḥudjr's sons such as 'Abd Allāh and 'Abd al-Raḥmān took part in Mukhtār's uprising.[2] On hearing the news of Ḥudjr's martyrdom, even a number of Ziyād's agents like the governor of Khurāsān, Rabi' Ibn Ziyād Ḥārithī, deplored greatly. It is said that Rabi' prayed for being died soon and by accident, he did fall down and pass away on the same day.[3] 'Āyisha was also among the protesters. She had dispatched 'Abd

---

[1]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp.205,206; al-Aghānī, vol.XVII. pp.151, 152, 153

[2]. al-Iṣāba, vol.I; p.315, A'yān al-shī'a, vol.20, p.61 (From Mustadrak and Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā)

[3]. Futūḥ al-buldān, pp.400,401

al-Raḥmān Ibn Ḥārith to Mu'āwiya to recommend him not to murdering Ḥudjr but prior to his arrival Ḥudjr had been martyred.[1]

Later, 'Āyisha reproached Mu'āwiya for Ḥudjr's murder[2] as saying, "I would object to you for Ḥudjr's murder if it were not the case that anything we dissented occurred in a worser form".[3]

Ḥudjr's devoutness had prompted 'Āyisha to object to Mu'āwiya in this regard though his standing in Djamal War was for Imām 'Alī (a) and against 'Āyisha.

As usuall, Mu'āwiya resorted to deception and deniedthat he had murdered him.

"Those who testified against him were his murderer", he added.[4]

The consequences of such a claim in sight of some like Ḥasan Baṣrī[5] were their disbelief in the Umayya and then their discredit among people.

It was quoted from Mu'āwiya as declaring, "Anyone whom I slayed I knew why I did it except about Ḥudjr."[6]

Abī Zur'a has narrated, "Whenever I met Mu'āwiya, he recalled Ḥudjr."[7]

While in the agony of death, he had stated, أي يوم من حجر وأصحاب حجر[8] "Where are those days with Ḥudjr and his followers."

In his very last breath, Ḥudjr had requested to be buried with the same shirt owing to the fact that he desired to stand before Mu'āwiya with that state on the Day of Judgment.[9]

Historians have said, أول ذل دخل الكوفة قتل الحجر وقتل الحسين ودعوة زياد[10] "The first abjectness for Kūfa was the martyrdom of both Ḥudjr Ibn 'Adī and Imām Ḥusayn plus Ziyād's claim to be Abū Sufyān's son."

Gragually the relation between Imām Ḥusayn and his Shi'ite Muslims improved rapidly. Having paniced, in a letter, Mu'āwiya warned Imām not to creat separation, sedition and corruption among the nation. As a riposte,

---

[1]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.VI, p.219; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.208; al-Aghānī, vol.XVII, p.154

[2]. al-Iṣāba, vol.I, p.315

[3]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.208; al-Aghānī, vol.XVII, p.154

[4]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.208

[5]. Ibid..

[6]. Tahdhīb Tārikh Dimashq, vol.IV, p.84

[7]. al-Mustadrak, vol.III, p.469

[8]. A'yān al-shī'a, vol.XX, p.58

[9]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.VI, p.220

[10]. al-Aghānī, vol.XVII, p.13

Imām protested against martyring 'Alī's Shi'ite Muslims, the foremost of whom Ḥudjr Ibn 'Adī, and deplored for he never took up arms against Mu'āwiya. We will show the letter later concerning Imām Ḥusayn's stance against Mu'āwiya.

One of the other followers of Ḥudjr martyred at the same juncture was 'Amr Ibn Ḥamiq Khuzā'ī who was among Prophet and 'Alī's disciples and later deemed as the pivot of the Shi'ite Muslims in Kūfa.[1] When Ziyād had ordered his guards to trace Ḥudjr and his companions, 'Amr Ibn Ḥamiq along with Rufā'a Ibn Shaddād escaped to Ctesiphon and then to Mūṣil. The governor of the district sent a mission to arrest them who were aliens. Rufā'a fled but 'Amr was taken to Mūṣil governor, 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Uthmān Thaqafī. Recognizing 'Amr, he wrote to Mu'āwiya what the proper course was to pursue.

Mu'āwiya wrote, "'Amr himself had confessed he had given nine lashes to 'Uthmān, thus whip him nine times." And since 'Amr was sick, with the very first lash he achieved martyrdom. Then he was beheaded and sent to Damascus. It was the first head carried from one town to the other.[2] Later it was repeated about the head of Imām Ḥusayn and his disciples. That it has been written that he was found dead in a cave and they beheaded him[3] seems to be for acquitting Mu'āwiya of the charge of Companions-cide Muḥammad Ibn Ḥabīb has narrated that his head was showed around in Bāzār.[4]

Conquests in Mu'āwiya's time

With the five-year civil wars in 'Alī's term, conquests in east and west of the Islamic land ceased. Inasmuch as 'Alī's policy was improving the internal status quo and deposing seditious figures, the process of conquests was ceased. Mu'āwiya who required great might to combat 'Alī(a), had to compromise the Romans.[5] Accordingly, war was ceased there as well. After victory of the Umayya, conquests leading to economic benefits for the government were resumed.

The areas ruled by the East Roman Empire were frequently under attack that lasted for almost all years of Mu'āwiya's dominion. In 49 or 50 A.H., Mu'āwiya deployed a massive army consisted of 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās and

---

[1]. Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn, vol.III, p.10

[2]. al-Aghānī, vol.XVII, pp.143-144; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.197; al-Daradjāt al-rafī'a, p.343; al-Muḥabbar, p.292

[3]. al-Daradjāt al-rafī'a, p.432

[4]. al-Munammaq, p.490

[5]. al-Fā'iq fī Gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.I, p.46; al-Muwaffaqiyyāt, p.301

Abū Ayyūb Anṣārī together with another group of disciples and their descendants to that area. They could advance as near as the enclosures of Constantinople; Nevertheless, they could not conquer it. Abū Ayyūb Anṣārī passed away there.[1]

Another war site was Africa thereon Muslims advanced ceaselessly in the course of conquering Egypt from the time of caliphII on. Sūdān in Africa was conquered in this period. Observing the constant apostasy of the dwellers, the governor, 'Uqba Ibn Nāfi', established a town called Qīrawān in order to guarantee the stability of the region through Muslim residents there.[2] This town did play a crucial role in maintaining Muslims' conquests in that land.

Islamic East was also subject to conquering. For a while Said, 'Uthmān's son, was involved in conquering Bukhārā and the suburbs. He clashed with the Soghdids in Samarqand but later he compromised with them.

He had taken a number of hostages from the queen of Bukhārā to set them free after return from conquering Samarqand. In spite of his pledge he took them to Medina and exploited them. Afterwards Sa'īd was assassinated by them.[3] The war had been continuing during the following years.

India and Indus River were exposed to consecutive wars as well. These areas, between Kābul and Multān, were hit in 43 A.H. and onwards which preceded a great deal of loot.[4]

In farther areas like Ghawr, conquering had been also kept on. In 47, when the dwellers of the region violated their compromise, the attacks on them were recommenced.[5]

From this time on, no considerable contest can be found for Muslims and it is in view of the fact that the Romans had prepared themselves to battle more valiantly on the one hand and the remoteness of war sites particularly Islamic East inhibited the Muslims to adopt serious measures for conquering the land, on the other hand. The problems originated from such conquests as well as Arabs' tribal disputes in conquered lands such as Khurāsān, gradually impeded more troops to be equipped for pursuing conquests.

The constant apostasy in conquered areas undermined the Muslim Arabs. Civil riots in the Islamic land such as Khāridjites movements, Shi'ites oppositions and so forth can be considered as another facter in debilitating the central authority.

---

[1]. Fi l-tārīkh al-kāmil, vol.IV, p.461

[2]. Fi l-tārīkh al-Kāmil, vol.III, p.465

[3]. Fi l-tārīkh al-Kāmil, vol.IV, pp.193-197; Futūḥ al-buldān, pp.401,402

[4]. Ibid, vol.III, p.446

[5]. Ibid, vol.III, p.456

THE KHĀRIDJITES IN MU'ĀWIYA'S TIME

Succeeding Imām's martyrdom, Kūfa was composed of classes with various schools of thought, the mojority indifferent, those on Mu'āwiya's side, those regarded as Khāridjites or Imām 'Alī's Shi'ite Muslims. As many people had lost their close kins in "Nahrawān" War, they naturally could not remain faithful to 'Alī's descendants. However, due to their enmity towards Mu'āwiya, they got ready to join the army organizied by Imām Ḥasan (a) against Mu'āwiya. After appearing indifference and inclinations on the part of the Kūfiyān nobles towards Mu'āwiya specificly in the process of compromising, the Khāridjites decided to assassinate Imām, although their attempt failed.

At the same time, Mu'āwiya predominated all over the Islamic land especially Iraq. The Khāridjites considered both enmity towards 'Alī (a) and practical disgust for Mu'āwiya and his agents as their principal responsibilities. On account of their disbelief in Taqiyya (precautionary dissimulation), a few[1] were assembled in a 40 or 70-people small group to clash with an army. Moreover, owing to their deep-rooted beliefs, even if deviated, they were never seeking after a means of escape. They, in light of their distinctive morale, in no way approved leniency.[2] If the Khāridjites hesitated over combating 'Alī (a) formerly but later they even those who were not convinced to combat 'Alī (a) in Nahrawān[3], had no doubts about battling against Mu'āwiya.

'Urwa Ibn Ṣakhr had stated, "Due to my long and close affinity with 'Alī (a) I did abstain from battling against him and now I shall definitely rise up against Mu'āwiya.[4]

In the face of such remarkable deviation as the Umayya's sovereignty, tyranny and oppression that the people of distinct classes sustained, the existence of the Khāridjites appeared evident. Since many of the oppressed regarded them as a group able to stand against the Umayya beside them, the continuity of their movement throughout this sovereignty was incontestable.

No sooner had Mu'āwiya left Iraq than the Khāridjites revolted. Nearly five hundred of them who had already gone to Shahrzūr with Farwa Ibn Nawfal returned Kūfa following the compromise. Mu'āwiya himself had the

---

[1]. But one time some groups of the Khāridjites believed in Taqiyya. See also al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.III. pp. 516, 518

[2]. They talked at availing themselves of "Taqiyya"; l-Kāmil fi l-lughat wa l-adab, vol.II, p.201; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.181

[3]. Because they had no proof for combating 'Alī; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.210

[4]. al-Kāmil fi l-adab, vol.III, p.276

people of Kūfa combat them.[1] Subsequenly, small groups of the Khāridjites like Mu'īn al-Khāridjī and Abū Maryam from among the Mawālī of Banū al-Ḥārith Ibn Ka'b and Sahm Ibn Ghālib revolted against Kūfa governor, Mughīra, so were all massacred.[2]

The leniency of Mughīra toward the Khāridjites culminated in their gathering from various regions in Kūfa. Therefore, they could confer with one another.[3] Having fled with four hundred of the Khāridjites to Riy, Mustawrid Ibn 'Ullafa after 'Alī's martyrdom returned Kūfa and together with Ḥayyān Ibn Ẓabyān convened meetings with other the Khāridjites.

Ḥayyān Ibn Ẓabyān who was a leader for the Khāridjites in Riy proposed them, "Let's return our homelands, towards our brothers in order to enjoin them good, forbid them from evil and summon them to battle against the parties. We have no excuse not to rise up while our governor generals are all tyrants, the tradition of guiding is abandoned and all those slaying our brothers are alive. We ought to avenge".[4]

When gathering in Kūfa, the Khāridjites negotiated about designating an emir. Three figures were nominated, Mustawrid Ibn 'Ullafa, Mu'ādh Ibn Djuwayn and Ḥayyān Ibn Ẓabyān. The report of negotiation is presented by Abū Mikhnaf. The aforesaid report is consisted of their opinions concerned with the eligibility of an emir.

Mustawrid said, "Elect anyone you like. It does make no difference for me whom from among you be my governor-general."

"I have no request for it. I shall be gratified with and swear allegiance to any one designated", said Ḥayyān. Mu'ādh Ibn Djuwayn also declared, "When you two, Muslims' Sayyid (chiefs) with renowned lineages, and as the high-qualified and pious ones say so, who shall then undertake Muslims' responsibility? If all are equal in virtues, the most well-informed in wars, the most intelligent in religion and the most liable of whom ought to be designated for Muslims' guardianship. Since both of you merit this position, thus one of you two should consent."

In return they, two, suggested it to him.

"You are my senior", he added.

The audience of the Khāridjites announced, "We approve you all three. Elect one from among yourselve."

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.126 (The events in 41)

[2]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.III, pp.412,417

[3]. Ibid, vol.III, pp.409,420

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, pp.173-174

Ḥayyān Ibn Ẓabyān told Mustawrid, "I do agree with Mu'ādh. You are my senior too. Give your-hand to swear allegiance to you".

In this way Mustawrid was designated. The Khāridjites swore allegiance to him all.[1] Mughīra who had perceived the probability of revolt arrested Ḥayyān Ibn Ẓabyān. Mustawrid and his followers rose in revolt, although Mughīra had warned the chiefs of all tribes earlier to banish them from themselves and not allow them to influence on their tribes.

Ṭabarī's report and that of Mubarrid's varies concerning the Khāridjites first clashes with Mu'āwiya. Yet, all are unanimous that the Khāridjites with a few numbers battled against Damascus army but were immediately defeated.[2]

Mubarrid and Balādhurī have recounted many adventures about the Khāridjites in Mu'āwiya's tenure that manifest the scope of their infiltration into diverse tribes.[3] At any war whether mini or massive, the Khāridjites had commanders.

After the Khāridjites' suppression, 'Alī (a) recommended his followers, لا تقاتلوا الخوارج من بعدي[4] "Under no circumstances should you enter into confilict with the Khāridjites after me."

This instruction was given by Imām to Shi'ite Muslims to bear their main enmity towards the Umayya in mind and not to waste their strength on combating the Khāridjites who were among the Umayya foes. Regretfully, this instruction was not heeded on the part of the Shi'ite Muslims.

Addressing his tribe and reiterating that they were faithful to Shi'ism and the leadership of the Prophet's household, Ṣa'ṣa'a Ibn Ṣūḥān, an eloquent chief of the Shi'ite Muslims said, لا قوم أعدى لله ولأهل بيت نبيّكم ولجماعة المسلمين من هذه المارقة الخاطئة الذين فارقوا امامنا واستحلوا دمائنا وشهدوا علينا بالكفر[5] "Not a single group like this group shows enmity towards Allāh, the Holy Prophet's household and Muslims; the wrongdoing Māriqīn (the deviators) who seceded from our Imām, declared shedding our blood lawful and considered us infidel."

This statement of Ibn Ṣūḥān foreboded that the Shi'ite Muslims' hatred of the Khāridjites made them not only remain indifferent in the face of their revolt but conversely become set on suppressing them. And it was exactly beacause almost all Shi'ite Muslims knew them as the fundamental cause for the failure of the Shi'ites movement. 'Adī Ibn Ḥātim, another Shi'ites

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.175

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, pp.165-166; al-Kāmil fi l-lughat wa l-adab, vol.II, pp.195-196

[3]. al-Kāmil fi l-lughat wa l-adab, vol.II, pp.198-212; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, pp.163-186

[4]. Nahdj al-balāgha, sermon 61

[5]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.142; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.III, p. 427

leader, had made the same remarks on aversion to the Khāridjites.[1] The command of war against the Khāridjites was undertaken by Ma'qal Ibn Qays who was a commander in Imām 'Alī's army.

As soon as being informed of the Shi'ite Muslims' inclination for a battle with the Khāridjites, Mughīra as well as his advisors became pleased and it was emanated from this fact that, وهم أشد استحلالاً لدماء هذه المارقة وأجرأ عليهم وغيرهم وقد قاتلوا قبل هذا بمرة[2] "... since they had battled with them once before, they could have shed their blood more daringly and severely."

Whatever its outcome might be even the Shi'ite Muslims' failure could be for the Umayya benefit because both rivals, the Umayya adversaries, had enfeebled each other.

Not merely had Imām 'Alī (a) realized and warned about such perils[3], but Imām Ḥasan (a) also had considered it wrong via his conduct practically. Subsequent to the compromise, when Imām (a) set out to Medina, a riot had been triggered by the Khāridjites. Mu'āwiya urged Imām to prepare for a battle against the Khāridjites.

In his reaction he stated, لو آثرت أن أقاتل أحداً من أهل القبلة بدأت بقتالك "If I were supposed to combat anyone, I would start from you first."

By the same token, in the course of Mustawrid Ibn 'Ullafa's revolt, along with three thousand from نقاوة الشيعة "The most purified Shi'ite Muslims."

Ma'qal Ibn Qays moved to him. While the Khāridjites were in the vicinity of Baṣra, the Umayya governor of Baṣra, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Āmir, did emulate Mughīra and dispatched three thousand Shi'ite Muslims led by Sharīk Ibn A'war who was a renowned Shi'ites of Baṣra towards them.[4]

Upon hearing the news of the strike by Kūfa army, Mustawrid took "counsel" from people. Some suggested battling and some other "retreating".

The decision, however, was to keep away from the army and refrain from confronting provided that they were faced unexpectedly which would result in a conflict.[5] The details of this conflict are delineated by Ṭabarī that

---

[1]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.143; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.III, p. 429

[2]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 144

[3]. From the view point of fiqh (jurisprudence) Imām had stated, ان خرجوا على امام عادل او جماعة فقاتلوهم وان خرجوا على امام جائر فلا تقاتلوهم Kill those who rise up against a just Imām and people, but never kill those rising up against an unjust ruler.

Wasā'il al-shī'a, vol.XI, unit 26, Hadith 3

[4]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.III, p.431

[5]. Ibid, vol.V, p. 193

Mustawrid was killed on the one hand and Ma'qal Ibn Qays on the other hand. At this juncture, the Khāridjites, who under no circumslances were eradicated, dispersed.

It is worth reminding that the Khāridjites of this period of time had an extremely harsh treatment towards other Muslims. The only caliphates confirmed in their sight were those of Abū Bakr and 'Umar so that they had laid them both beside "Kitāb" (Qur'ān) and "Sunna" (Tradition). In his narration, one of the Khāridjites has referred to a letter from Mustawrid to the governor of Ctesiphon whereas naming him Amīr al-Mu'minīn".[1] It denoted that he must have been regarded as a caliph by the Khāridjites.

It has been cited that the first one who propounded in earnest the subject of blasphemy on the part of the members of the tribe was Sahm Ibn Ghālib Hudjaymī who revolted against 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Āmir in Baṣra in 44 A.H.[2] This very issue could play a cardinal role in making the Khāridjites secede from the Islamic community. Baṣra was among the areas accommodating a multitude of the Khāridjites in those days. Rising up in this region, accompanied by some seventy people, Qarīb Azdī and Zaḥḥāf Ṭāyī were murdered in 50 A.H. following a clash. As recorded by Ibn Athīr, Ziyād who was too rigorous and unyielding towards the Khāridjites had prescribed his substitute in Baṣra, Samura Ibn Djundab, to treat them relentlessly. They clashed with a mass number of the Khāridjites and flourished to decimate them.[3] Their considerable number in Baṣra did account for such severe actions.

Once more rioting in 58 A.H. a group of the Khāridjites were instantly suppressed near to Kūfa. Ibn Ziyād's dealing towards the Khāridjites was also such a tough one that he at times incited them to slay one another. Concurrently a throng of them who were imprisoned by him became slaughtered after a while.[4]

At this stage like the succeeding ones the firm defiance of the Khāridjites against Umayya troops is utterly perceptible as once at the end of Mu'āwiya's caliphate, a forty-member group caused Ibn Ziyād's two-thousand-soldier army to flee and make the commander of which be humiliated for a lengthy time.[5]

---

[1]. Ibid, vol.V, p.191

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.172

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, p.463; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 177

[4]. Ibid, vol.III, pp.515,517

[5]. Ibid, vol.III, p.519

MU'ĀWIYA'S ENDEAVOR FOR HEREDITARY CALIPHATE

Earlier it was quoted from Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā that Abū Bakr's action in delegating a successor paved the ground of making caliphate hereditary.[1] As Marwān Ibn Ḥakam too reasoned Abū Bakr's measure in designating 'Umar while recommending succession to the throne.[2] A hereditary authority bore two features one of which was designation of a successor by the former monarch and another was designation of a son or a member from monarch's lineage as a successor. The latter was submitted from Mu'āwiya's time on. Under the pretext of his kinship with 'Uthmān, he not only addressed his heritance in order to justify his caliphate but also he proposed the subject of making caliphate hereditary by appointing his son, endowed with no religious, political or military trait. Although this matter has always been unusual among Muslims, hereditary caliphate later became the most fundamental principle in a caliph's designation. Merely when the Umayya's administration was converting into that of the 'Abbāsids and the 'Abbāsids' administration into that of 'Uthmānids the theory of hereditary caliphate was declared null and void through transfer of caliphate from a lineage to another, yet replaced by violence and force. Except the cases aforesaid the hereditary succession was treated as a radical principle for appointing a new caliph. Deviation from the traditional system, at least nominally claimed to be established on "consultation" and nation's vote, was intolerably disagreeable for believing Muslims. However, the status quo was in a way that all endorsed it and but a minority no one defied. The internal coherence of the Umayya reinforced by 'Uthmān's charity in addition to conveyance of farmlands impelled the Umayya to adopt a measure for safeguarding their power. If it were let to take its normal course, 'Uthmān would beyond question designate Mu'āwiya as his successor. And because it was delayed by his assassination, Mu'āwiya did afterwards withstand obstinately. It stood to reason that when securing the power, he on no accounts would allow the monarchy to make an exit from his family. Except the Shi'ite Muslims and the Khāridjites, throughout the Islamic world, in the face of the official caliphate not only no Sunnites laid claim to the caliphate but also he did never credit that through power and wealth one could become a caliph. Such regions as Spain, North Africa and Egypt experienced further caliphs later.

In Mu'āwiya's tenure, not simply did Damascus people never stood against approving of Yazīd's succession but they also insisted on it because their entity before claimants emerging from Arabia Petrae or Iraq depended upon aiding the Umayya to remain in power. Persuading the people of

---

[1]. Andīshih siyāsī dar Islām mu'āṣir, p.150

[2]. Tārīkh al-Khulafā', pp.196,203

Medina however who were, from among disciples' descendants, seemed thorny. On one hand, Iraq was naturally opposed to Damascus and besides Kūfa Shi'ite Muslims, Iraqi the Khāridjites were thoroughly opposed to the Umayya on the other hand. Realizing the public opinions about governorship at that time shall appear convenient through a review of the reasoning on the part of Mu'āwiya and his opponents in regard with a hereditary caliphate.

It was already discussed that Mu'āwiya's rule had lost its nature of caliphate and transformed into monarchism of which nature necessitated the subsequent caliphate or designation to be hereditary. 'Umar himself had by that time likened Mu'āwiya's rule in Damascus to those of Kasrā and Caesar. When Mu'āwiya secured the authority freelance, people named him "Heraclitus".[1]

The matter of making caliphate hereditary as well as Mu'āwiya's endeavor regarding it are set forth in detail in "Al-Futūḥ" and "Al-Imāma wa al-Sīyāsa". Others also have referred to it concisely. The ground for the notion of Yazīd's succession to throne could be paved following Imām Ḥasan Mudjtabā's martyrdom.[2] Despite the fact that there existed no unanimity on who had for the first time suggested this notion, many a look was at Mughīra Ibn Shu'ba. In late 40s A.H. Peeling that he might be deposed by Mu'āwiya due to his oldness and inability in running Kūfa, he set out to Damascus to stimulate Yazīd to talk about his did so to his father and he succeeded after all. Mughīra also on his part told Mu'āwiya that he feared that the recent events, sedition and divergence, in the course of 'Uthmān's caliphate might reoccur once again.

"You had better designate a successor and it would be far better if he were Yazīd, your son"[3], he added.

Admitting his proposal, Mu'āwiya delegated Mughīra to gradually prepare the ground in Kūfa. He dispatched a number to Damascus for this reason.[4]

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p.233; vol.V, p.101; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.III, p.506, such governorship was left as inheritance for Muslims' future. This approach was exercised not only for the 'Abbāsids and Fāṭimids in Egypt but also even from the Ṣafawids on in Shi'ites Iran.

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p.209; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.175; what is narrated in al-Futūḥ is that 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ had been the stimulater. By the some token since 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ had passed away in 43 A.H., it cannot be correct.

[3]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.187

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.224; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.165; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.III, p. 503

Beyond any doubt such a notion had been in Mu'āwiya's mind for a long time, but Mughīra's was a sparkle for making it public. After Ziyād Ibn Abīh became the governor of Kūfa, Mu'āwiya propounded the issue of successorship. Totally negligent of Mu'āwiya's intention, he did his utmost by a trick to change Mu'āwiya's and even Yazīd's mind in this respect.[1]

From 55 on the effort Mu'āwiya made to stabilize Yazīd's position multiplied. On a trip to Mecca and Medina, religious centers Mu'āwiya exerted himself to engross the people through substantial open-handedness. It does surprisingly merit consideration that people seemed gratified, however. The poets such as 'Uqayba al-Asadī and 'Abd Allāh Ibn Hammām al-Salūlī who hated Yazīd composed some verses of poems for reproaching him although Mu'āwiya could muzzle them with paying hush-up money.[2]

When he returned to Damascus to keep on his activities, he summoned groups of people from Kūfa and Baṣra. Mu'āwiya compelled Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Qays to address the congregation and advance the issue of successorship. Consequently, indicting Iraqi people for being hypocritical and schismatic, he denounced them.[3] In the same meeting, Aḥnaf Ibn Qays announced, "As long as Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī is alive, the people of Iraq and Ḥidjāz will neverever swear allegiance."

Accusing the Iraqi of Hypocrisy, Qays Ibn Ḍaḥḥāk said, "Ḥasan and ones like him have nothing to do with divine king whom He has appointed; caliphate is not inherited collaterally from a daughter."

Aḥnaf Ibn Qays, in his response, reminded Mu'āwiya's commitments promised to Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī and referred warningly to Iraqis' loathing for Mu'āwiya which might cause the swords to rise up from Iraq. After that, Mu'āwiya kept silence about allegiance to Yazīd until 50 (Imām Ḥasan was martyred in 49 A.H).[4] Mu'āwiya appointed Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Qays and 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Uthmān, advocating Yazīd strongly in that very meeting, as the governors of Kūfa and Ḥidjāz respectively to pave the way.[5]

Mu'āwiya was of this opinion that from the standpoint of religion the main problem lies in Medina. Were it feasible to persuade Iraq by force, reasoning would definitely be required for Medina to get satisfied.

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp. 224,225

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, pp.225,226; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.III, p.508

[3]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.28; al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p.231; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, pp.166-169

[4]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, pp.187-194

[5]. Ibid, vol.I, p.171; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.I, p.182

Already written to Mu'āwiya by Sa'īd Ibn 'Āṣ was, "...People follow these few individuals therefore as long as the latter have not sworn allegiance, the former would by no means do so."[1]

Ibn Qutayba had also written that but few, all did hesitate to swear allegiance. Typically they were the Hāshimites neither of whom did so.[2] Before he came, Mu'āwiya had sent various letters mingled with either menace or allure to all those opposing allegiance.[3]

In a session convened on this occasion following Mu'āwiya's arrival in Medina, opposers voiced their diverse opinions.

'Abd Allāh Ibn Dja'far addressed Mu'āwiya as saying, "If you have recourse to Qur'ān, Ulū al-Arḥām (relatives) enjoy priority over one another; if you practice the Prophet's Sunna (tradition), they are the kins of Allāh's Apostle (s); and if you practice the Sunna of Abū Bakr and 'Umar, who would ever be more deserved than the Prophet's household? By Almighty Allāh, if Wilāyat (Islamic jurisprudential guardianship) were lain with them after the Prophet, 'Amr (authority) would have been properly conveyed to the rightful. Caliphate does belong to Quraysh. O Mu'āwiya, fear from Allāh! Here are 'Abd Allāh Ibn Dja'far, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, 'Alī's sons, and it is me, Zubayr's son.[4] You are well aware of our positions!" Warned 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr.

'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar stated that caliphate was not those of Heraclitus or Kasrā to be inherited from fathers.

"If it had been the case, I should have as a result secured the authority after my father. This caliphate not only belongs to Quraysh but also to those whom Muslims comply with and are more pious furthermore," he added.

Irrespective of securing allegiance for Yazīd, in his response, Mu'āwiya uttered, "This belongs to 'Abd Manāf's descendants since they are from among the Prophet's kins. People themselves aided Abū Bakr and 'Umar to secure the power. Although they were brought up by no monarch or caliph, they had extremely admirable lifestyles and conduct. Monarchism was transferred to 'Abd Manāf after them and it will remain perpetually among them until the Day of Judgment. And you! O sons of Zubayr and 'Umar! Allāh has deprived you from this authority." Afterwards he returned to Damascus.[5]

---

[1]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.182

[2]. Ibid, vol.I, p.177

[3]. Ibid, vol.I, p.178,179,180,181

[4]. Mentioning the name of Imām Ḥasan does not seem incorrect because this narration referes to the year after his martyrdom.

[5]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, pp.194-196

According to some sources, at the very same meeting, somewhere else in his intimidating speech, Mu'āwiya had warned that if they did not swear allegiance, لأفعلن كذا وكذا "He would do so and so."[1]

Mu'āwiya told Imām Ḥusayn (a), "I procrastinated this city's allegiance owing to the fact that they are from among the kins of mine. If I could feel that there existed anyone else better than my son among Muḥammad's Umma (nation), I would neverever let him be picked out."

Imām (a) who had been agitated for his remarks, accused Yazīd of being debauchee and drinking wine.

Menacingly, Mu'āwiya warned him as saying, "Be cautious lest someone from Damascus (accompanying Mu'āwiya)[2] hear your voice."[3] Later he threatened others concerning the people of Damascus.[4]

'Āyisha was among the oppossers.

Regarding the lawfulness of Yazīd's successorship Mu'āwiya told her, "It is a Divine destiny about Yazīd. No one has the option. The nation has considered swearing allegiance to him as its duty and has sworn to him. Do you think they must breach their allegiance?"[5]

Another reasoning on the part of Mu'āwiya vis-a-vis the opponents was the Imamate permit for an inferior over a superior. Addressing Imām Ḥusayn (a) and a number of disciples and contrasting them with Yazīd and qualifying him to be well acquainted with Kitāb and Sunna, he stated that in the war of Dhāt al-Salāsil, Allāh's Apostle (s) had singled out 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ as superior over Abū Bakr and 'Umar and appointed him as the commander. Accordingly, if the Prophet (a) were a good model, such an action i.e the superiority permit of an inferior over a superior would certainly appear reasonable then. By the same token, they should concur with Yazīd's caliphate.[6]

In return, Imām Ḥusayn in his lengthy sermon alluded to the extorted right of his lineage after prophet's demise as well as Yazīd's black records

---

[1]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.236

[2]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.183; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.III, p.508

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, pp.240,241

[4]. Ibid, vol.IV, pp.243,244; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, Vol.I, p.188

[5]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.205

[6]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.208; later on Ṣufyāniyya also in order to substantiate the legitimacy of Mu'āwīya's caliphate and although there existed some having previous record in Islam, had narrated that 'Umar had preferred Abū 'Ubayd Ibn Mas'ūd to forty participants of Badr; Rasā'il al-Djāḥiz, al-Rasā'il al-siyāsiyya, pp.391-392

and added, "O Mu'āwiya! How can you reason out by what is already abrogated."[1]

Dissenting 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar, Mu'āwiya replied, "You have declared yourself that you can never go to bed while swearing allegiance is on your responsibility. This issue is divine destiny about Yazīd and there is an option for noone. People have sworn allegiance to him."

'Abd Allāh touching upon the predecessor's manners pointed out, "The caliphs preceding you had surely have offsprings. Although theirs must have been for better than your son, they at no time did what you do about yours."

'Abd al-Raḥmān, Abū Bakr's son, recommended this job be assigned to a council.[2] What else Mu'āwiya in his public speeche to dwellers of Medina vocalized was that Allāh's Messenger (s) did designate no successor to himself; howevere, Abū Bakr did and neither did 'Umar behave like him. He assigned it to a six-member council. Inasmuch as neither Abū Bakr did like the Prophet nor 'Umar like Abū Bakr, I am, therefore, able to do what they had never done both, I do designate my successor.[3] Another question Ibn Zubayr posed was whether it was credible to swear allegiance to him where as his father, Mu'āwiya, was alive. He voiced to Mu'āwiya that he would be ready to swear allegiance to his son provided that he abdicates himself. If he swore allegiance to his son while he himself is alive, whom should he abide by?[4] This problem was solved after a while though it was the starting-point of the process at that time. It is quoted from Ibn Zubayr that on the strength of the hadith, لا طاعة لمخلوق في معصية الخالق "No one is entitled to be obeyed while the creator was disobeyed" he contradicted the allegiance to Yazīd.[5]

In order Mu'āwiya to allure a group of eminent opponents, he sent gifts, nevertheless, Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī declined.[6]

Being unable to flourish in Medina, he left it for Mecca. He guessed new schemes now. Mu'āwiya made those coming from various spots for pilgrimage come together and he proclaimed later that a few swore allegiance to him for Yazīd privately. A number of people from Damascus with their swords sheathed out yelled out that have to do so openly, but Mu'āwiya made them silent. Climbing down the pulpit, he distributed a many present among them and set out for Damascus. Although those individuals were present at the assembly, they dare not deny. However, later

---

[1]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.209

[2]. Ibid, vol.I, p.210; Tārikh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, pp.213-214

[3]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.212

[4]. Tārikh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, p.214

[5]. Tārikh Ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.228

[6]. Ibid, vol.IV, p.240

they revealed that it has been naught but a trick and they had never sworn.[1] Since Mu'āwiya had not sent any present to the Hāshimites, the 'Abbāssids intimidated him. That he would go around Damascus and stimulate people against him. Mu'āwiya had to concede and send [2] but Imām Ḥusayn (a) declined them all once again.[3]

A few years later, not merely he himself re-secured allegiance for Yazīd but he also wrote to the governor of Medina to do so from people. "People are all conforming to these few ones such as Ḥusayn (a), 'Abd Allāh Ibn Abī Bakr, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr as well as 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar and not a single one of them can be convinced to swear allegiance to me," wrote Sa'īd Ibn 'Āṣ, the governor, to Mu'āwiya.[4] The dwellers of Damascus propounded the issue of inheritance and admitted it as a principle in caliphate. A poet had composed as follows,

فان تأتوا برملة أو بـــــهند نبايعـــها أميـــرة مؤمنيـــنا
أذا ما مات كســـرى قام كسرى نعـــد ثـــلاثـــة متنـــاسقينا

"Were Ramla or Hind introduced as the caliph, we would swear allegiance to her as Amīra al-Mu'minīn (the Commanderess of the Believers) and if a Kasrā passed away and another Kasrā replaced him, they would be all three equal at our sight."[5]

And also 'Abd Allāh Ibn Hammām al-Salūlī had composed for Yazīd as,

تعزّوا يا بني حَرْب بِصَبْر فمن هذا الذي يرجو الخُلودا
تلقّاها يزيدٌ عن أبيـــــه فخذها يا معـــاوِي عن يزيدا
أديروها بني حرب عَلَيْكم ولاترموا بها الغرض البعيدا[6]

"Soothe yourself with patience. Who does ever expect an eternal life in this world? Yazīd inherited the caliphate from his father and you O Mu'āwiya Ibn Yazīd assume it from your own father, Yazīd. O Ḥarb's sons, do maintain the caliphate amongst yourselves and never relinguish it."

What has been observed within the poems belonging to Umayya poets was that they have treated Umayya caliphs as the successors of Allāh's Messenger (s).

إن الوليد وليُّ عهد محمّد كلُّ المكارم بالمكارم يَشْتَري[7]

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, pp.248,249

[2]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.191; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.III, p.511

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p.245

[4]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.204

[5]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.37; al-Bad' wa l-tārīkh, vol.VI, p.8

[6]. al-umawiyyūn wa l-Khilāfa, p.73; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, part 2, p.5; Ṭabaqāt Futūḥ al-shuwrā, p.626; Nasab Quraysh, p.129

[7]. Dīwān Farazdaq, vol.I, p.336

"Walīd being in the position of Muḥammad's successor responds with good), had composed Farazdaq regarding Walīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik."

It has been ignored that this approach was perfectly unknown for the disciple's descendants and what 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar had asserted, "This caliphate is dissimilar to those of Heraclitus and Khusraw that anyone who departs a son of his replaces him".

'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Abū Bakr also stated, "We desire to hear not a word about Roman's tradition according which any Heraclitus passed away, another Heraclitus substituted him.[1] Here, it has been endowed with the narrations from those following the Divine Books as well in order to forebode the indubitability of Mu'āwiya's and Yazīd's caliphate though it does not stand to reason whether such narrations have solely been manipulated at that time or the Umayya's adherents had fabricated them later. A typical narration of Ka'b al-Akhbār in light of Mu'āwiya's caliphate has been subsequent to 'Uthmān's assassination.[2]

'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ famed for dealing with the books written by followers of the divine Books had conducted a survey of books in Christians' churches in Damascus before he informed Ibn Zubayr, "In conformity with my research on books, you will claim caliphate, yet you are not a caliph but Yazīd Ibn Mu'āwiya is. Also quoted from him is, ملك الارض المقدسة معاوية وابنه "Mu'āwiya and his son are the kings of the holy earth"[3]

In course of such a process, counterfeited hadiths can be traced, as an instance, "The Holy Prophet had prophesied Mu'āwiya's future caliphate."[4]

All endeavors made on the part of Mu'āwiya to stabilize Yazīd's position fulfilled whilst large numbers of those at odds in Iraq and Ḥidjāz still remained like fire under ashes.

It was mentioned that the dwellers of Damascus persisted on Yazīd's successorship and it was in view of the fact that first, Umayya Islam was predominant and the Umayya was deemed as the manifestation of Islam and secondly their benefits in comparison with those of Iraq necessitated to advocate the Umayya. Ultimately, they pressured Mu'āwiya, in his last days of life, into introducing his son. Making him wear the caliphate robe, Mu'āwiya officially appointed him as his successor.[5]

In an account written to Yazīd, appointing him as the next caliph after him, Mu'āwiya wrote, "Bear in mind, the Umayya along with the family of

---

[1]. Amālī, Abū 'Alī al-Qālī, p.175; Tathbīt Dalā'il al-nubuwwa, p.575

[2]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.XXV, pp.24-25

[3]. Tārīkh khalīfat Ibn khayyāṭ, p.218

[4]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.XXV, pp.16-17

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p.255

'Abd Shams must be granted priority over the Hāshimites and so must the family of 'Uthmān over the family of Abī Turāb as well as the descendants"[1] and in such a way the future policy for the Umayyads was specified by him.

While Mu'āwiya was expressing his regret and sorrow for shedding the blood of Ḥudjr Ibn 'Adī and 'Amr Ibn Ḥamiq under his breath, he resigned his shameful life after nineteen years and three months of rule in Radjab, 60 AH.

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p.257

CHAPTER VII
KARBALĀ MOVEMENT

IMĀM ḤUSAYN BEFORE KARBALĀ'

Although far too many remarks have been constantly made in light of Imām Ḥusayn's features as yet, purely for luck and good omen, Several of which shall be referred too.

This magnanimous Imām was born on Sha'bān 3,4 A.H. And having been intimately beside the Prophet, his forefather, he could never detach himself from him even at the prayer time. Allāh's Messenger, who adored him and his brother exceedingly, could demonstrate a profile of their virtues through his statements to his disciples. In hadith books many virtues describing Imām Ḥusayn (a) can be detected. Mostly like the hadith of, الحسن والحسين سيدا شباب أهل الجنة "Ḥasan and Ḥusayn are both the masters of the youth of Paradise dwellers."

They are repeatedly narrated by successive generations and considered authentic. The Prophet's extreme affection for these two sons was entirely overt to all disciples. As hinted at concerning with Imām Ḥasan, the Prophet has been doing his utmost so hard to make the nation conscious of his true attachment to them both that he stated, من أحبني فليحب هذين[1] "O Allāh, adore the one who adores these two" من أحب الحسن والحسين فقد أحبني، ومن أبغضهما فقد أبغضني[2] "The one feeling affectionate for Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, feel so for me; nonetheless, the one making them wrathful, has made me too" هما ريحاني من الدنيا[3] "These two are my fragrant flowers from universe."

Among the virtues exclusively narrated about Imām Ḥusayn the most well-known of all is, حسين منّي وأنا من حسين[4] "Ḥusayn is from me and I am from Ḥusayn."

---

[1]. Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p.135

[2]. Ibid. p.136

[3]. Ibid. p.131

[4]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p.137; see Farā'id al-simṭayn, a precious reference, for more information concerning these two Imāms. Among the recently published books in "Faḍā'il al-khamsa fi Ṣiḥāḥ al-Sitta", Ahl Bayt's virtues are compiled from Sunnites' famous books.

It has been narrated by Yaḥyā Ibn Sālim Mawṣilī, Imām Ḥusayn's governor, as saying, "As we were walking accompanying Imām, he stopped to knock on a door and ask for water. A bondswoman came out holding a bowl of water. Prior to drinking, he took out a piece of silver and offered it to her and then said, "Give it to your family". He drank afterwards.[1]

Abū Bakr Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Ḥazm has recounted that when Imām Ḥusayn had been passing by the platform whereon a group of the underpriviliged was having food, he was requested to have a share in.

"Under no circumstances does Allāh love the arrogant", stated Imām and dismounted to eat. Later, Imām told them, "You invited me and I replied in the affirmative. Now I invite you and I expect you to comply with". Addressing his wife, Rubāb, he demanded her to provide what she had prepared.[2]

It is quoted from Imām Bāqir (a) that for pilgrimage, Imām Ḥusayn inclined towards moving on foot whereas his horses were all going behind him.[3]

Attending the wars of Djamal, Ṣiffīn and Nahrawān, Imām Ḥusayn battled against those breaching their promise and exerting oppression with his father side by side. A sermon is narrated from him in Ṣiffīn whereby he persuaded people to struggle.[4] From the very nitrating stages of Ṣiffīn, Imām Ḥusayn had had such a determining role in capturing the route of water from the soldiers of Damascus that after the victorious result Imām 'Alī asserted, هذا اول فتح ببركة الحسين (ع)[5] "It was the ever-first conquest for the sake of Ḥusayn's blessing."

After Imām was called and told by 'Ubayd Ibn 'Umar that his father had done such and such to Quraysh, Imām accused him of abiding by Qāsiṭīn (the apostates) and added that these kinds of individuals have consented to Islam reluctantly but as a matter of fact they are in no way Muslims.[6]

The one who earnestly and thoroughly upholded Imām Ḥasan's policy during his tenure was Imām Ḥusayn (a). In spite of frequent demand by Iraq for Imām's travel to Kūfa even after his brother's Matyrdom, His Excellency did never incline and warned that it shall look irrational taking an action as long as Mu'āwiya is alive. This utterance denoted that for a ten-year interlude Imām endured Mu'āwiya compulsorily. This point can be

---

[1].Ibid. Ibn Sa'd, p.146

[2]. Ibid. p.149

[3].Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p.145

[4]. Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXII, p.405

[5]. Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXIV, p.266

[6]. al-Futūḥ, vol.III, p.35

regarded as of significance in Imām Ḥusayn's political standings although rarely is it taken into account. And the reason might be due to the fact that we notice Imām Ḥusayn merely from the standpoint of his revolutionary action in Karbalā.

Both the relations between Imām and Mu'āwiya and the conversation that they have had under various conditions profoundly manifest Imām's politically unyielding manner in acceding the legitimacy of Mu'āwiya's rule. One of the most credible evidence is Imām's lengthy letter to Mu'āwiya therein numerous facts about Mu'āwiya's atrocity against 'Alī's Shi'ite Muslims has been revealed. "Never do I intend to oppose you nor combat you", Imām wrote.

Then he added,

وأيم الله لقد تركت وأنا أخاف الله في تركه وما أظن الله راضياً مني بترك محاكمتك اليه ولا عاذري دون الاعتذار اليه فيك وفي اوليائك القاسطين الملحدين حزب الظالمين وأولياء الشياطين...أولست قاتل حجر بن عدي وأصحابه المصلين العابدين الذين ينكرون الظلم ويستعظمون البدع ولا يخافون لومة لائم، ظلما وعدوانا بعد اعطائهم الأمان بالمواثيق والايمان المغلظة، أو لست قاتل عمرو بن الحمق الخزاعي، صاحب رسول الله الذي أبلته العبادة وصفرت لونه وانحلت جسمه،... أو لست المدعي زياد بن سمية المولود علي فراش عبيد عبد ثقيف وزعمت أنه ابن أبيك وقد قال رسول الله صلي الله عليه وآله وسلم, الولد للفراش وللعاهر الحجر، فتركت سنة رسول الله صلي الله عليه وآله وسلم وخالفت أمره متعمدا واتبعت هواك مكذبا بغير هدى من الله، ثم سلطه على العراقين فقطع أيدي المسلمين وسمل أعينهم وصلبهم علي جذوع النخل، أولست صاحب الحضرميين الذي كتب اليك ابن سميه أنهم على دين علي، فكتبت اليه، اقتل من كان على دين علي ورأيه، فقتلتهم ومثل بهم بأمرك؛ ودين علي، دين محمد صلي الله عليه وآله وسلم الذي كان يضرب عليه أباك والذي انتحالك اياه اجلسك مجلسك هذا ولولا هموا[1] كان أفضل شرفك تجشم الرحلتين في طلب الخمور...فلا أعلم لنفسي وديني أفضل من جهادك، فان أفعله فهو قربة الى ربي وان أتركه فذنب أستغفرالله منه في كثير من تقصيري... فابشر يا معاوية بالقصاص وأيقن بالحساب واعلم أنّ لله كتاب لايغادر صغيرة ولا كبيرة الا أحصاها وليس الله بناس لك أخذك بالظنة وقتلك أوليائه علي الشبهة والتهمة للناس بالبيعة لابنك غلام سفه يشرب الشراب ويلعب بالكلاب ولا أعلمك الا قد خسرت نفسك وأوبقت دينك وأكلت أمانتك وغششت رعيتك وتبوأت مقعدك النار فبعداً لقوم الظالمين

"By Almighty Allāh, I relinquished combating against you meanwhile I have fear of Him. I surmise not that Allāh would be gratified with me unless I allow Him to adjudicate about you the atheist and ruthless party as well as the devils' supporters. Were you not the one who slayed Ḥudjr Ibn 'Adī and his followers brutally, those who struggled in a bid to abolish oppression and oppose the heresy while dreading no jeopardy? But then with recourse to swearing oaths, you gave them a quarter. Were you not the assassin of 'Amr Ibn Ḥamiq Khuzā'ī, he who was among the Prophet's disciples and whose too much worshpping had emanciated and enfeebled his physique and transformed his expression...? Were you not the one who claimed brotherhood with Ziyād Ibn Sumayya, a newborn whose begetter was 'Ubayd 'Abd Thaqīf where as you declared that he was your father's son? It

[1]. It is refereed within this very text that it must be "هم".

was while the Holy Prophet had affirmed that the newborn belongs to the one who does beget it and it is requisite that the adulterer be stoned to death. Deliberately, you ignored the Prophet's Sunna and disobeyed him and with no divine guidance you still sought after your carnal desire. Heedless of the fact that Ziyād cut out Muslims' hands, blinded them and hung them from the palm trees, you gave him predominance in Kūfa and Baṣra. Did you not slay those two from Ḥaḍram, attributed to Ḥaḍr Mawt, those about whom Ziyād wrote to you that the, two, believed in 'Alī's religion and you responded that anyone being of the same religion and belief as 'Alī ought to be slaughtered? As a result, he did slay and mutilate them at your behest. It's the fact other than this that 'Alī's religion is in every respect Muḥammad's, the one against whom our father battled? And this religion was what thereby you won this position and if it were not of existence, your only virtue would be merely the tolerance of difficulties during the summer and winter trips seeking for intoxicating drink... I deem naught more momentous than Djihād against you for myself and my religion. I shall draw nearer to my Lord if I do accomplish it but I should ask Him for forgiveness for my neglect and error unless I did accomplish it ... O Mu'āwiya! I give you glad tidings of retaliation for Ḥudjr's murder! Never doubt and be informed that there exists a book for Allāh wherein any sin whether minor or major is accurately recorded. Yes, never ever will Allāh fail to remember you for all those whom you have cynically arrested and skeptically slayed; for all those whom you compelled to swear allegiance to your insane, wine drinker and dog-fancying son. What I can say is that you let yourself sustain losses, rendered your religion futile, abused what has been left in your custody, deceived your peasant and consequently you fill you grave with fire to overflowing. May Allāh keep the oppressors away from us!"[1]

Elsewhere, Balādhurī has brought the letter in brief having an additional sentence, وما أعلم فتنة أعظم من ولايتك هذه الامة "I know of no sedition being more dreadful than your rule over this nation."[2]

Later, no sooner had Mu'āwiya faced Imām Ḥusayn than he inquired, "Have you heard what we did for Ḥudjr, his followers and your father's Shi'ite Muslims?

"What?" asked Imām.

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, pp.154-155, footnote; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.224; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.180-181; al-Iḥtidjādj, vol.II, p.20; pp.48,49; al-Daradjāt l-rafī'a, p.434; Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, vol.II, p.121; a part of the letter in al-Muḥabbar, p.479. therein the names of the two from Ḥadram whose martyrdom was mentioned by Imām are referred to as Muslim Ibn Zaymur and 'Abd Allāh Ibn Nudjā.

[2]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, Ibn 'Asākir, p.198

We murdered them, Mu'āwiya replied, wrapped them in shroud, performed prayers for them and interred them.

Imām stated in return, "Neither would we wrap them in shroud, perform prayers for them, nor bury them, if we killed your followers."[1]

By the same token, Mu'āwiya resorted to any means to suppress the opponents. He even put the holiest figures to the test through alluring. In this way, once he had strivde to silence Abūdhar in Damascus. Here, we demonstrate an amazing example about Mu'āwiya's policy toward Imām Ḥusayn (a), the policy that Mu'āwiya had adopted to relieve Imām's wrath about the Umayya by sending presents.

Narrated by Aṣma'ī is that a gorgeous bondswoman was brought for Mu'āwiya. When he questioned her price, he was told "100,000 dhms". Mu'āwiya purchased her. Taking a look at 'Amr Ibn 'Āṣ, he asked who deserved that woman.

'Amr and all those present said, " Amīr al-Mu'minīn does".

"No", Mu'āwiya contradicted, "She is solely appropriate for Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī." "For his family dignity, he deserves her the most", he added. "It can remove the indignation stemmed from the contention between his father and I." He commanded that they dispatch her to Imām as a gift. Making her ready for a journey after forty days, they sent her along with a great deal of goods, clothes and so forth. In a letter, Mu'āwiya wrote to Imām that Amīr al-Mu'minīn purchashed a bondswoman and although he loved her, he granted her to him generously. After the bondswoman was brought in, upon seeing her, Imām who was astonished at her charm, inquired what her name was.

"Hawā (passion)", she responded.

Imām stated, "How becoming is the name to you! Can you read anything?"

Yes, I can, she replied, both Qur'ān and poem.

Imām demanded that she recite Qur'ān. She prefaced,

وَعِنْدَهُ مَفَاتِحُ الْغَيْبِ لَا يَعْلَمُهَا إِلَّا هُوَ...

"All means for discovering the hidden things are with Allāh and no one else knows them but He..."

Being requested by Imām to read poems if she knew, the bondwoman asked "Am I immune enough?"

"Certainly", Imām answered.

The woman read,

---

[1]. al-Daradjāt al-rafī'a, p.429; Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, pp.231-232

أنت نعم المتاع لو كنت تبقي غير أن لا بقاء للانسان

"What a precious property you would be if you survived, what a pity no one will survive."

In regard with the content of the poem, Imām burst into tears and said, "Not only are you liberated, but also all sent goods are yours."

"Have you composed anything concerning Mu'āwiya?" he asked.

"Sure, I have," She responded,

رأيت الفتي يمضي ويجمع جهده رجاء الغني والوارثون قعود
و ما للفتي الا نصيب من التقي اذا فارق الدنيا عليه يعود

"I saw a youth passing by and dreaming about riches while his heirs were waiting in an ambush. There is no one higher for a youth but piety, for when passing away it would give him a hand."

Imām, ordering to offer her 1000 dhms as well, stated that his father had also composed regarding it,

و من يطلب الدنيا لحال تسـرّه فسوف لعمري عن قليل يلومها
اذا أدبرت كانت علي المرء فتنة وان اقبلت كانت قليلا دوامها

"Anyone, who seeks after this world to make him cheerful for a moment, by myself, he will regret presently; when he turns back on it, he faces problem and when he turns toward it, it will be transient."

Afterwards, Imām wept and stood up to pray.[1]

Earlier when discussing the issue of making caliphate hereditary, we elucidated Imām's stance against Mu'āwiya's measures. Imām was one of the most notable opponents at that juncture who spared no effort for expressing his opposition in this respect.

Throughout the years when Imām Ḥusayn and his brother were in Medina, Marwān was the governor of the city whose abomination and abusiveness was proverbial and searched for an occasion to slander and insult Imām 'Alī (a).

Abū Yaḥyā has recounted, "I was present while Marwān and Imām Ḥusayn were wrangling. Imām Ḥasan (a) could cease his brother but Marwān kept on so courteously that he said "You, Ahl al-Bayt, are all cursed." This utterance was the manifestation of Marwān's innate and deep-rooted malice. Upon hearing, Imām Ḥasan reacted that, والله لقد لعن الله أباك علي لسان نبيه وأنت في صلبه "Allāh had cursed your father with the tongue of His Messenger where as you were still in his loins."[2] Accordingly, in this way came Marwān's vengeance towards the prophet (s).

---

[1]. Tārikh Madinat Dimashq, Tarādjim al-nisā', pp.469-470

[2]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, Ibn Sa'd, pp.145-146.

Once Mu'āwiya did his best to persuade the daughter of 'Abd Allāh Ibn Dja'far Ibn Abī Ṭālib to marry his son, Yazīd. When 'Abd Allāh consulted Imām Ḥusayn (a), Imām advised, أتزوجه وسيوفهم تقطر من دمائنا؟ "Do you intend to offer your daughter to the one down whose swords our blood drips?"

"Convince her to marry your nephew, Qāsim Ibn Muḥammad".[1]

In compliance with another narration, Mu'āwiya's intention for this action was creating reconciliation between the Umayya and the Hāshimites in other words, making the Hāshimites surrender to the Umayya.[2]

Imām Ḥusayn's Opposition to Yazīd's Caliphate

As preplanned, Yazīd became the caliph subsequent to Mu'āwiya's death in Radjab, 60 A.H. No sooner had this news spread through Medina than Yazīd exerted himself to secure allegiance from all those opponents whose opposition might wage a revolt against him.[3] Writing a letter to Walīd Ibn 'Utba Ibn Abī Sufyān, governor of Medina, Yazīd urged him to secure allegiance from 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr and Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī (a). Marwān also commanded that Walīd dispatch the soldiers to them at that very night and if they defied, they should decapitate them all on the spot in view of the fact that that night seemed an opportunity to suffice to revolt and summon people.[4]

Imām Ḥusayn who was informed of Mu'āwiya's death through the message-bearer of the governor of Medina, proceeded to the palace accompanied by a number of followers armed to guard Imām against any probable menace. Being asked by Walīd to swear allegiance to Yazīd, Imām stated that such a figure like him ought not to swear privately but openly in a mosque. Walīd concurred, but Marwān made an attempt threateningly to provoke him into arresting Imām. Imām, furious with Marwān, addressed Walīd as saying, أيها الامير! انا اهل بيت النبوة ومعدن الرسالة ومختلف الملائكة ومحطّ الرحمة وبنا فتح الله وبنا ختم ويزيد رجل فاسق شارب خمر، قاتل النفس المحرمة معلن بالفسق ومثلي لا يبايع مثله "O emir! We, Holy Prophet's household, are the mine of Prophetic mission, angels' companions and the fountain of mercy. Allāh has commenced with us and so will He terminate with us. By no means will I swear allegiance to Yazīd who is libertine, wine-drinker, murderer of the venerated and the one debauching in public."

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, Ibn Sa'd, p.149.

[2]. Ibid. p.150.

[3]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl,p.227.

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.11.

It was at the same session where Imām affirmed in reaction to Marwān's insistence in securing allegiance, "The knell of Islam will be rung if Yazīd is supposed to secure the power, وعلى الاسلام السلام.

Vindicating through the verse of Taṭhīr (purification), he commented on Ahl al-Bayt's meritedness in obtaining the caliphate.[1] This vindication was what had been narrated by Imām 'Alī(a) and Imām Ḥasan (a) as well.

At the same night, Ibn Zubayr departed from Medina and was pursued by the governmental guards next day. Next night Imām Ḥusayn did so[2] in a trip along with all Ahl al-Bayt and the only one remained in Medina was Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya.[3] It is told that the date of departure was Sha'bān 3, 60 A.H. concurrent with his birthday.

When Imām stepped into Mecca, the residents became quite delighted and even Ibn Zubayr who was a leader himself took part in Imām's congregational prayers and hadith sessions.[4] Since Mecca was assumed a religious base for Islam, it was naturally the center of attentions where Imām was in touch with various distinguished and ordinary individuals and interpreted the reasons of not swearing allegiance to Yazīd.

Looking forward to experiencing such a day for quite a long, the Shi'ite Muslims of Kūfa became elated by hearing Imām's resistance against Yazīd and his arrival in Mecca. They had already condoled Imām Ḥusayn on Imām Ḥasan's martyrdom in a letter and invited him; nevertheless, Imām had refused. In the held meeting, such Shi'ites leaders as Sulaymān Ibn Ṣurad, and the others made speeches and propounded Imām's invitation to Iraq. Despite the agreement all announced, Sulaymān stressed all to undertake and not to violate; they renounced their commitment.[5] And then a joint letter was written by a few regarded as Shi'ites leaders such as Sulaymān, Musayyib Ibn Nadjba, Ḥabīb Ibn Maẓāhir, Rufā'a Ibn Shaddād as well as 'Abd Allāh Ibn Wāl inviting Imām to come to Kūfa.[6]

Their letter remained unanswered on Imām's part. After a while, other letters were consecutively sent and above all Qays Ibn Musahhar Ṣaydāwī, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Wāl and several others personally travelled to Mecca. On account of the additional letters received by Imām one after another the status quo modified in such a way that it was something beyond the bounds

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.17.

[2]. Dinwarī, p.228.

[3]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.IV, p.16; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.15.

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.37

[5]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.260-261; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.46. This emphasis was because they were infamous for not supporting 'Alī and his son, Ḥasan.

[6]. The letter is fullyread in al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.IV, p.20

of possibility for Imām to pay no heed to the inviters.[1] When Hānī Ibn Hānī went to Mecca, he reported people's presence in general and the distinguished's readiness in particular and it managed to be a confirmation and emphasis on letter's contents.

Dispatching Muslim to Kūfa

The first action Imām took was dispatching Muslim to Kūfa. Imām addressed him as saying, وان رأيت الناس مجتمعين على بيعتي فالعجل لي بالخبر حتى أعمل علي حسب ذلك[2] "Notify me swiftly to adopt a measure in case you perceived that the people are totally willing to swear allegiance to me."

Muslim, around 40, was singled out from among Ahl al-Bayt for this vital mission. As stated by historians, en route to Medina and then to Iraq from Mecca, Muslim lost his way and one of or both couriers conducting him breathed their last. He, in a letter, asked permission to return but Imām's response was to accomplish his mission.[3]

Muslim entered Kūfa and resided in Mukhtār's house, being renowned among Shi'ite Muslims. He commenced to secure allegiance. Summoning to Divine Book, Prophet's Sunna, Djihād against the oppressors, defending the oppressed, aiding the needy, fair distribution of Bayt al-Māl (public treasury) among Muslims, backing prophet's household, compromising the one whom they compromise, battling the one against whom they battle, abiding by Ahl al-Bayt's word and action and not practicing the contrary, were all among the stipulated conditions of allegiance.[4]

In an interval of thirty five days after Muslim's arrival, Shawwāl 5, 60, nearly 18.000 people swore allegiance to him. In addition to Shi'ite Muslims, ordinary people were among them too, as an example Muḥammad Ibn Bashīr said, "I'd like Allāh to assist my friends although I do never like to be killed, nor do I like to lie". The gap formed succeeding Mu'āwiya's death among the Umayya opponents in Iraq was filled by Muslim's arrival. All surrounded Muslim. While the might of government had mitigated, Muslim could openly visit people more easily than before.

The Umayya's spies who were discontented with the status of Nu'mān Ibn Bashīr, in a letter wrote to Yazīd that the more he required Kūfa, the

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, pp.49,50

[2]. Ibid. vol.V, p.53.

[3]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.263-264. Some researchers deny such events. Mab'ūth al-Ḥusayn, p 90.

[4]. al-Shahīd Muslim, p.104; these sentences are not in historical books but Muqarram by availing Himself of narrations related to allegiance of 'Aqaba and Yawm al-fatḥ has referred approximately to them.

sooner he should adopt a measure.[1] Muslim also was engaged in recruiting forces and preparing military weapons. About Abū Thumāma Sa'īdī it is narrated, يشتري لهم السلاح وكان به بصيرا "As far as his full acquaintance with weapons was concerned, he was delegated to purchase them."[2]

Later on, Ibn Ziyād had accused Hānī, "Your house has been a refuge for Muslim's followers and a cache for the weapons".[3]

Yazīd appointed Ibn Ziyād as the governor of Kūfa while he was the governor in Baṣra as well. According to historians, in a will given to his servant to transfer to Yazīd later, Mu'āwiya had appointed Ibn Ziyād to confront any probable riot in Iraq.[4]

Having executed Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī's message-carrier in Baṣra, Ibn Ziyād set out for Kūfa to suppress the insurgents through harshness he had inherited from his father.

The most practical and efficient tool resorted by Ibn Ziyād for suppression of the Iraqi was nothing save threat. Since the inception, he summoned the distinguished of the city and ordered that they are duty-bound to introduce the aliens and those whose arrest is pleasant for Yazīd, Khāridjites and all those willing to create disunion and conflict and also register their names. And if one did not carry out his own responsibility, any mischief done by aforgoing persons would be upon his conscience and the ruler would on no accounts protect him. In that sense, shedding his blood and confiscating his possessions would be presumed lawful.[5]

The pressures from the side of Ibn Ziyād propelled Muslim to change his residence and act in secrecy. The new place was Hānī Ibn 'Urwa's house, one of the chiefs of the tribe of Madhḥidj and it seemed to be more secure. Ibn Ziyād was searching for him confusedly. Appointing a spy to claim amity with Ahl al-Bayt, he could locate his whereabouts. Ibn Ziyād apprehended Hānī first and urged him to hand over Muslim. At the same time, those belonging to the tribe of Madhḥidj rose up. But Shurayḥ Qāḍī treacherously assured them that Hānī was alive and Ibn Ziyād's guest; therefore, he could dispel them.[6]

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, pp.59,60.

[2] Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 271

[3]. Ibid. vol.IV, p. 273; al-Kāmil fī l-tārīkh, vol.IV, p.28.

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.265; al-Kāmil fī l-tārīkh, vol.IV, p.21.

[5]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.267; al-Kāmil fī l-tārīkh, vol.IV, pp.24, 25.

[6]. Tadhkirat al-khawāṣ, p.242. Later on Shurayḥ had said, "As Ibn Ziyād had appointed an agent to watch me, I scared to give Hanī's message to the members of the tribe that he was under duress."

Muslim took an action and demanded a few numbers that they summon their friends by chanting the slogan of "O the helper of nation" which was one of the slogans of the Prophet at the time of wars. While making a sermon in the mosque, Ibn Ziyād heard the voices. He who crawled into the palace, concealed himself behind all the locked portals. Muslim's army besieged the edifice but by reason of something indefinite the back portal remained unbesieged through which the distinguished of Kūfa were regularly in touch with Ibn Ziyād. That door was known as "Bāb al-Rūmīyyīn". The throng accompanying Muslim was such a countless number at first that it could terrify Ibn Ziyād and his people and confine them in the palace.[1]

Incited by Ibn Ziyād, the distinguished of Kūfa began menacing. "Tomorrow, an army will arrive from Damascus and will do such and such," they warned people.[2] Another group made the members of their own tribes secede from among Muslim's followers, Going after their husbands and children, the women said preventively, والناس يكفونك [3] "Others are present."

"They will fill the gap of your absence."

After a couple of hours many dispersed,[4] وصلي المغرب وما معه الا ثلاثون رجلاً "Only did thirty people participate in his congregational evening prayer."

Afterwards they also dispelled!

Ibn Ziyād, daring not to exit from terror, commanded to check inside the mosque which was joined to the edifice from the roof to see whether someone was there or not. With throwing down a torch, they made sure that no one was there; therefore, they commenced searching for Muslim in the city. Ibn Ziyād had commanded to inspect all the houses in Kūfa door to door and arrest Muslim.[5]

Ultimately he was traced and after a short clash he was taken to Ibn Ziyād. يا شاق! خرجت علي امامك وشققت عصا المسلمين "Have you come from your Imām's side," inquired Ibn Ziyād, to remove Muslims' union?

Muslim replied that he in no way recognized not only Mu'āwiya's caliphate but also beyond any question his son's as legitimate because he oppressively usurped the caliphate from Prophet's successor.[6]

---

[1]. al-Kmail fi l-tārīkh, vol.IV, p.31

[2]. al-Irshād, p.210, Around 4000 people is reported.

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.277; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.87; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.IV, p.31.

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.227.

[5]. al-Irshād, p.212.

[6]. Al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.98.

"The inhabitants of this city are all of this belief that your father has shed the blood of their kins and misbehaved like Caesar and Kasrā", he added, "we have come to establish justice and summon people to Allāh's and the Prophet's decrees."[1]

In order to mar Muslim's reputation among people and to put his deception in practice, Ibn Ziyād said, "In Medina, you have been drinking!"

Sedately, Muslim asserted, "Someone like you for whom slaying innocent people is insignificant will be superior to me if I drink".[2]

Muslim whose whole perturbation was for the sake of Imām Ḥusayn (a), called 'Umar Ibn Sa'd being from Quraysh and claiming to be Muslim's relative to make his will. What he recommended him was, first, to dispatch one to Ḥusayn and hinder him from coming to Kūfa; secondly, to wrap his corpse in a shroud and bury him and thirdly, by selling his sword and other belongings, to pay for his debts. Then Muslim was martyred.

Although beyond any doubt Muslim was a chaste and pious man, Imām Ḥusayn's confidence in him, on one hand, and his debt in Kūfa, on the other hand, proves the point. He did never ask someone for a loan[3] and all this time with 700 dhms he had already loaned could make ends meet. At the threshold of his martyrdom he was determined to sell his belongings for clearing his debt.

Another point in his characteristic was that once the ground was prepared for Muslim to kill Ibn Ziyād but he did not. After Ibn Ziyād had gone to Kūfa with Sharīk Ibn A'war, a Shi'ites in Baṣra, Sharīk became sick and had to rest in Hānī Ibn 'Urwa's house who was one of the Shi'ite Muslims as well. Ibn Ziyād was set to visit Sharīk while Muslim was concealed there. Prior to his arrival, Sharīk proposed Muslim to take this golden opportunity and attack Ibn Ziyād after a special cue, which was reading verses of poem. Never did Muslim do so however. Being reproved by Sharīk after Ibn Ziyād left, Muslim stated that Hānī did not feel like Ibn Ziyād to be murdered in his house. Also, he referred to a hadith from the Prophet that, الايمان قيد الفتك "Such a murder is not confirmed in Islam at all."[4]

The firstly abovementioned point can not be that acceptable about Hānī unless presumably he might have been dreading that with arrival of the dwellers of Damascus later his life might be wholly lost. And about the second one, even though Muslim had reasoned through that hadith, now it merits consideration due to the fact that killing Ibn Ziyād who was a corrupt

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.IV, p.35.

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, pp.98,99; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.283.

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.57; Maqtal al-Ḥusayn, vol.I, p.197; Mab'ūth al-Ḥusayn, p.123.

[4]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.IV, p.27.

and criminal man at that moment could change the future of Iraq and Karbalā effectively. The Holy Prophet(s) himself in Medina had delegated a group to go to Mecca and kill Ka'b Ibn Ashraf and Abū 'Afak were both killed in the same manner. Killing not Ibn Ziyād had a political motivation, some pointed out. And people would have gone from Damascus to Kūfa, afterwards, for taking vengeance and plundering it.[1] It should not remain untold that they would go there whether Imām Ḥusayn was victorious or not and it had no relevance to Ibn Ziyād's assassination. And later in the process of besieging his palace, why people left Muslim alone simply was never disclosed. Should this accident be blamed on the people of Kūfa only or was it because the leader of the movement could not persuade the people to remain?

How Muslim's whereabouts was located is very interesting. In order to locate Muslim's hiding place, Ibn Ziyād had paid one of his servants. The servant who went to the mosque was looking for him according to the criteria he had heard about the Shi'ite Muslims. A person, performing prayers continuously, drew his attention. ان هولاء الشيعة يكثرون الصلاة وأحسب هذا منهم "Since the Shi'ite Muslims pray innumerably I guess that man is a Shi'ites"[2] he said to himself.

The man was Muslim Ibn 'Awsadja. After several testings, he could not detect his dastardly plot and while deceived took him to Muslim. The utterance evidently manifests that Shi'ite Muslims have been famed for asceticism and worship.

Imām's Movement Towards Iraq

As Imām's official representative had verified the readiness of Kūfa, there was no longer enough time for a moment's hesitation. With regard to the letters received as well as Muslim's letter the scene was beyond question set for rising against the Umayya; therefore, Imām hastened in such a way that on 8th Dhi l-Ḥadjdja and exactly in thick of Ḥadjdj (pilgrimage) he changed "'Umra Tamattu'" (a kind of Ḥadjdj) into "'Umra Mufrada" (another kind of Ḥadjdj) and then set out to Iraq. Wasting a moment could influence the status quo in Iraq. Furthermore, in view of the fact that Imām's assassination was probable in Mecca, his stay looked by no means proper. Reportedly, Imām's fellow-travelers were 80 people; nonetheless, they are to be more suggested by some other narrations. The number might denote only those accompanying Imām as far as Karbalā.

---

[1]. Mab'ūth al-Ḥusayn, pp. 152, 153

[2]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.249.

En route, Imām's first encounter was with a caravan moving from Yemen to Damascus. What it was transporting were presents for Yazīd's court. Intercepting the caravan, Imām appealed to them for joining him if willing; otherwise, they ought to return.[1] Imām from Na'īm, the area where he encountered the caravan, proceeded to al-Ṣafāḥ and it was where he met Farazdaq, a young poet at that time. After Imām asked him about the conditions in Kūfa, he responded, قلوب الناس معك وسيوفهم عليك "The people's hearts are with you whereas their swords are drawn at you too."

When he arrived at Baṭn al-Ramma in a letter while touching upon Muslim's letter informed the people of Kūfa to prepare for his entry.[2] Qays Ibn Musahhar who had become responsible for taking the letter on his way to Kūfa encountered Ḥusayn Ibn Numayr's army and was arrested. Eating the letter on the spot, Qay was then martyred by Ibn Ziayd.

In another area, called Zadūd, Imām saw Zuhayr Ibn Qayn. As soon as he heard of Imām's invitation and with his wife's persuasion he became one of Imām's close followers though he was an 'Uthmānid. He later asked his friends if they had enthusiasm for martyrdom they could join him; otherwise, they could take their way to Mecca.[3]

It was Dhāt 'Irq where Imām Ḥusayn (a) informed of both Hānī's and Muslim's martyrdom in a message given by a man from Banū Asad.[4] As quoted, Imām came to a decision to return but Muslim's brothers impeded. Never does it seem that Muslim's brothers either intended or were capable of compelling Imām to go on to Kūfa if he were reluctant. Owing to the fact that in order to stimulate Imām to go, some had said, والله ما أنت مثل مسلم بن عقيل ولو قدمت الكوفة لكان الناس اليك أسرع "You are not Muslim, upon stepping into Kūfa all will unite behind you at speed."[5]

Imām was still decisive. The message Muslim had left to 'Umar Ibn Sa'd prior to his martyrdom and had pleaded to him for transferring it to Imām was received in Zabāla.[6] No sooner had the time elapsed than the martyrdom news of Qays Ibn Musahhar[7] and 'Abd Allāh Ibn Yaqṭur, Imām's foster-brother spread. What these reports could indicate was that everything has changed in Kūfa and the present status was utterly distinct from that of the

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.164; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl,.245; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp. 289-290.

[2]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.245

[3] Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.247

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p. 120

[5]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.300

[6]. The message was that Imām Ḥusayn should return to Ḥidjāz as soon as possible.

[7]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p. 247, 248

past reported by Muslim. At this very moment, Imām brought together all accompanying him and addressed them, أيها الناس قد خذلتنا شيعتنا فمن أراد منكم الانصراف فلينصرف "O people, our Shi'ite Muslims left us alone. Anyone willing to return can return."[1]

A number of people who had joined Imām halfway went back and the only ones remained were Imām's special friends.[2] They were those who not only were with Imām from Mecca,[3] but also before that from Medina.[4] Nevertheless, those detaching from him were Arabs who had imagined that they would enter a town with Imām therein all were his followers.[5] When the reality was revealed, they returned without hesitation.

After this stage, Imām kept on moving again. Here, it had become fully explicit for Imām that going to Kūfa was under no circumstaces rational according to political evaluations; however, there existed an issue that, beyond politics, should differently be taken into account. Imām proceeded to Sharāt where he made an overnight stay. He was moving next day that Ibn Ziyād's army led by Ḥurr Ibn Yazīd Riyāḥī appeared from the distance and blocked Imām's way.

The People of Kūfa and Karbalā Event

Here, it would seem convenient if we analyze the position taken by the people of Kūfa towards the event of Karbalā.

Among the historical sources as well as common people, the dwellers of Kūfa have been introduced infamous and treacherous. What has been described concerning them was that being faithful to promises was invisible amongst them. While enumerating a few features of the people of Kūfa, we referred to their rashness and it could invariably be to the detriment of them and their rulers at the time of decision-making. To be easily resented and easily persuaded, from one hand, and simply surrendering and disobeying, from the other hand, were all a profile of their split personalities.[6] Here, let's consider their standing.

The population in Kūfa included those from various tribes each of which enjoyed different arrangements during the different rulers' terms. The

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.169

[2]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.248

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.169

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp. 300, 301

[5]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.300

[6]. See, Acquaintance with the people of Kūfa at the beginning of discussion about Imām Ḥasan's Caliphate.

expediency the rulers regarded accounted for the variety in the classifications of tribes. Yet, the rulers mostly made allowances for the chiefs or the distinguished of the tribes bearing the fact in mind that in some situations their might was far more than that of governors'.

Merely a part of the population was formed by Shi'ite Muslims. Although a number of tribes were famous for Shi'ism, hardly ever could they be deemed to be first class Shi'ites tribes. They who were dispersed among the tribes had no unity. Since in addition to tribal morale they had a certain kind of Kūfiyān morale; as a result, no discrepancy was conspicuous between them and others.

The count of Shi'ite Muslims was not considerable at all then. Reportedly, when in the mosque, Ḥudjr Ibn 'Adī dissented Ziyād's remarks only a half or a third was concordant. With reference to Shi'istic morale of the town and assuring that the beliefs of a number of people were based on a kind of political Shi'ism according to which they only assented to join 'Alī's descendants relatively in political issues, the Shi'ites process of the town consisted of at least a fourth of the total population.

No one doubts that Kūfa had invited Imām Ḥusayn but did not assist him and later conducted his murder. Notwithstanding, it ought to be perceived who they have been, who had written the letters and how many from Kūfa participated in the battle against Imām. It is also worth mentioning that, later on, Kūfa turned into a hub for 'Alī's Shi'ite Muslims and even reacted against Banū 'Abbās who usurped the sovereignty of 'Alī's descendants. Aside from the historians and hadith-narrators affiliated to the Umayya who loathed the people of Kūfa, those of Banū 'Abbās had the same feeling. The oppressedness of the Shi'ite Muslims was not only political but also cultural. With the cultural sovereignty of Banū 'Abbās such a thing appeared thoroughly natural. Accordingly, much attention should be paid to the fact that the trend of narrating the events is observed through a pair of spectacles the color of which is as dark as disgusting Kūfa for the sake of its Shi'ism.

Taking the aforesaid point into consideration, it should also be noted that such historians are all doing their utmost to prove that Shi'ite Muslims are unfaithful to the promises; in other words, Shi'isın foes are determined to attribute the advocating not of Kūfa to Shi'ite Muslims. On the contrary, the elaboration below will somewhat indicate that, at that time, only a minority of people remained Shi'ites and they were in a position that they could not defend Imām Ḥusayn (a) although they would if they sacrificed devotedly. This utterance is what we present proofs for, in brief.

Visualizing the status quo of Kūfa, it could be as to say that Yazīd was a man who seemed, although tolerable for Damascus, he was extremely intolerable for Iraq. As soon as he secured the power, Shi'ite Muslims in Kūfa began protesting. Since many in Kūfa found no appropriate substitute

for Yazīd and while affected by the public atmosphere, they elected Ḥusayn Ibn ʻAlī (a). Besides, Iraq was normally unwilling to concede the domination of Damascus. When the invitation was made on the part of Shiʻite Muslims, not simply did the common people, having special morale, expressed their advocacy, but also those who either assumed their positions in peril or were influenced by others, announced their support behind Ḥusayn Ibn ʻAlī (a).[1] It resulted in an artificial but public atmosphere of support for him. The Umayya was also incapable of filling the political gap created subsequent to Muʻāwiya's demise for a while. This atmosphere was continuously expanding and particularly, as a result of Nuʻmān Ibn Bashīr's governorship, who was no strict at all, prevailed as long as Ibn Ziayd entered Kūfa.

By taking a glance at a hadith by Imām Ḥusayn, a further likelihood about the invitation on the part of the distinguished may be regarded that they intentionally added fuel to the flames to take Imām to Iraq and martyr him. The hadith was as follows, وما كانت كتب الي الا مكيدة لي وتقرباً الى ابن معاوية "They wrote nothing but for trickery and keeping closer to Ibn Muʻāwiya."[2]

Anyhow, the atmosphere was prepared so positively that upon realizing it, Muslim felt that Imām should set out to Kūfa as soon as possible.

Kūfa Under the Pressure of Ibn Ziyād

Scarcely ever can a person be at variance or rebel while the ruling system is of domineering and audacious dictatorship. When Nuʻmān Ibn Bashīr, compassionate somehow, was the governor of Kūfa, people dared reveal their Shiʻism without constraint and when Muslim entered the town, they warmly welcomed him with the Ibn Ziyād's substitution for Ibn Bashīr, the tide turned against all at once. Ibn Ziyād's great savagery had terrorized many a person. Those who were oversensitive and made decision impetuously no only were they menaced by Ibn Ziyād, but also they were terrified by the present propaganda about pending arrival of an army from Damascus.

No sooner had few days passed than the withdrawal on the part of Muslim's supporters expedited. The nobles of the town who were now certain about the dominion in Kūfa and had no doubt about the Umayyads's stability, stood up for them overtly. They have kept all silence as yet. Many others also looked not it expedient to be at odds with the chiefs of their

---

[1]. Men such as ʻAmr Ibn Ḥadidjādj and Shabath Ibn Ribʻī who were commanders of Ibn Ziyād's army in Karbalā were among those writing letters to Imām Ḥusayn. See al-Futūḥ, vol.V, pp. 50-51.

[2] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p. 185; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p. 169.

tribes. These nobles were the ones who minimized Muslim's allies through alluring and threatening when Muslim attacked Ibn Ziyād's palace and they intended to manifest their power in controlling the people.[1]

The status in Kūfa had taken such a new shape that before Ibn Ziyād's despotism even if a chief had defied, the members of the tribe would have never dared to be on his side. As recounted by historians, when Hānī Ibn 'Urwa, chief of Banū Murād, was arrested "four thousand cavalrymen and eight thousand infantrymen" were his supporters. If the allies of Banū Murād joined them from Kinda, the total would be thirty thousand people. Despite the fact when he was dragged along in Bāzār with his hands tied and while he was imploring one to help, no single helper appeared.[2] After a short time, he was martyred whereas no one dissented at all.

During Imām Ḥusayn's sojourning in Karbalā, in his remarks Ibn Ziyād ordered the people to left Kūfa for Karbalā. He threateningly warned that, فأيّما رجل وجدناه بعد يومنا هذا متخلّفا عن العسكر برئت منه الذمّة[3] "From today on whoever disobeys the army, he shall no longer be protected by us."

It denoted that his punishment would be murder. In order to search in the town for anyone not complying with the army, Ibn Ziyād delegated Qa'qā' Ibn Suwayd. Qa'qā' while inspecting traced a man from the tribe of Hamdān who had come there to secure his father's inheritance. After he had been taken to Ibn Ziyād, he issued the verdict of his assassination. Later, فلم يبق محتلم بكوفه إلا خرج الى العسكر بالنخيلة[4] "Not a matured one could be seen in Kūfa unless he had joined the army, Nukhayla."

It was now when all swords were pulled against Imām Ḥusayn (a). Assuredly, if people were free in their actions, by no means would they do so, since a great number were in the same condition.[5] And now what Farazdaq had composed can be perceived concerning Kūfa, قلوبهم معك وسيوفهم عليك[6] "Their hearts are with you while their swords are drawn against you"

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 277, Ibn A'tham, writing the letter was a trick against me and for becoming nearer to Yazīd.

[2]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.59

[3].Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.178; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, pp. 245, 255

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.179

[5]. It was noticed, in Iraqi war against Iran, how it compelled Iraqi people to combat Iranian Muslims. By the same token, such people are culprit and we do never intend to acquit the people of Kūfa this way, But there is a vast difference between the one who goes freely and the one going under duress. However, many chiefs and nobles and those affiliated with the Umayya whom later Zaynab and Umm Kuthūm blamed went to Karbalā willingly.

[6]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.290; al-Futūḥ vol.V, pp.120,124; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.245; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.165

or أنت أحب الناس إلي الناس والقضاء في السماء والسيوف مع بني أمية[1] "You are the dearest of all, amongst people, but divine decree is in the sky and swords are beside the Umayya."

For delineating the sense of this utterance, we can reason to Mudjamma' Ibn 'Abd Allāh al-'Ā'idhī quotation, that joined Imām from Kūfa as saying "The nobles are all in opposition to you and though the hearts of the rest are with you, tomorrow they will pull the swords against you".[2] Under those existing circumstances, people could not help going to Karbalā owing to the fact that their stay coincided with their slay. The Shi'ite Muslims or those being reluctant to do so had two alternatives, one, to ally themselves with Imām, two, to flee from Kūfa and Karbalā.

It can be well detected from varying reports that the group of people, who were coercively sent to Karbalā for a battle against Imām Ḥusayn, either fled halfway, or did not appear in Karbalā at all. The total number of soldiers recruited for Ibn Ziyād's army and announced in Karbalā was the census, which was taken while dispatching them to Karbalā; nonetheless, a throng of them had fled halfway. There must have been some ten thousand people or less in Karbalā whereas compared with the population of Kūfa it was considerably few. It is said that Kūfa mosque had been accommodating forty thousand people.[3] What this fact does disclose is that many had either concealed themselves in Kūfa or fled halfway.

Balādhurī has written, وكان الرجل يُبعث في ألف فلا يصل إلاّ في ثلاثماة أو أربعماة وأقل من ذلك كراهة منهم لهذا الوجه[4] "A commander was sent with a thousand troops but when entering Karbalā the troops were reduced to as few as three hundred, four hundred or even less. And it stood for the disgust people bore for moving there."

"When a commander along with a great many was sent to Karbalā by Ibn Ziyād", wrote Dīnwarī, يصلون إلي كربلاء ولم يبق منهم إلا القليل كانوا يكرهون قتال الحسين فيرتدعون فيتخلّفون[5] "A great few arrived in Karbalā and it was due to the aversion they had to battle against Ḥusayn, hence they preferred to return and secede from the army."

In addition to fleeing, a number's endeavor was to join Imām Ḥusayn for his support. When Imām entered Karbalā, it could be eight days before his martyrdom. No one could ever dream about occurrence of a war and Imām's

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn of Ibn Sa'd, p.171; Tardjamat al-Ḥusayn, Ibn 'Asākir, p.206

[2]. al-Kāmil fī l-tārīkh, vol.IV, p.48

[3]. Tashayyu' dar masīr tārīkh, p.160

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.179

[5]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.254

martyrdom. It was ʻĀshūrā morning when Ḥurr Ibn Yazīd perceived how serious the situation was and allied himself with Imām. Many people might have had the same idea as Ḥurr. He told Imām, بابي أنت وأمي! ما ظننت الأمر فينتهي بهؤلاء القوم إلى ما أرى وظننت أنهم سيقبلون منك إحدى الخصال التي عرضتها عليهم فقلتُ في نفسي لا أبالي أن أطيع القوم في بعض أمورهم[1] "May my parents be sacrificed for you! I could never imagine that people's conditions might be culminated in such a phase I observe. I presumed that they might consent to one of the several alternatives you proposed. I said to myself that I would not mind if I abide by them in a few affairs, but now..."

It was merely Ḥurr who joined Imām together with a few numbers. Although some might have it in mind, they could not make their decision. Even if Shi'ite Muslims intended to defend, they did not hasten and only did special ones draw decisively a conclusion and could join Imām at the very beginning. Among those who joined Imām were Nafī' Ibn Hilāl Murādī, 'Umar Ibn Khālid Ṣaydāwī, Sa'd, one of 'Umar Ibn Khālid's governors and Mudjamma' Ibn 'Abd Allāh al-'Ā'idhī from the tribe of Madhḥidj.[2] By the day of 'Āshūrā, Muslim Ibn 'Awsadja and Ḥabīb Ibn Maẓāhir could reach there. As written by Ibn Sa'd, in 'Āshūrā morning, some twenty men joined Imām.[3] Ibn Qutayba has reported the number as many as thirty.[4] Further names are referred to by historians.[5]

Noticing such escaping and joining, Ibn Ziyād had to prevent them; consequently, he took an action. Ibn Sa'd who was one of the first narrators has written, وجعل الرجل والرجلان والثلاثة يتسللون إلى حسين من الكوفة "When Ibn Ziyād was notified that people were joining Ḥusayn individually or in two people or three-people groups."

Commanding to prepare the barracks, he appointed 'Amr Ibn Ḥurayth to drive the people into Nukhayla. His order was also keeping watch on the bridge not to allow one to flee.[6] Ḥusayn Ibn Numayr was duty-bound to patrol the area between Qādisiyya and Quṭquṭāna to identify anyone proceeding to Ḥidjāz inasmuch as under this pretext they might join Imām.[7] Ibn Ziyād wrote to his governor in Baṣra to send a signal man to control the

---

[1]. Tadjārib al-umam, vol.II, p.70

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.172

[3]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn of Ibn Sa'd, p.178

[4]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.II, p.7

[5]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.IV, p.73

[6]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn of Ibn Sa'd, pp.178-179

[7]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.243

routes and if anyone traversed, he should arrest him.[1] It is absolutely obvious that whom they meant were those who might come to aid Imām. Similarly, Ibn Ziyād had commanded that the routes between Wāqiṣa and Damascus up to the route of Baṣra be tightly restricted, ولا يدعون أحد يلج ولا يخرج "and not to allow anyone to move and exit through it."[2]

Once Ḥabīb Ibn Maẓāhir prompted the tribe of Banū Asad, being in the vicininty, to help but 'Ubayd Allāh's army alienated seventy of them from Imām's army and did not permit them to join Imām.[3] At this juncture, many were in prison. Among the prisoners was Mukhtār Ibn Abī 'Ubayda who was apprehended and whipped by Ibn Ziyād. Whipping caused Mukhtār's one eye be blinded for ever.[4] This tight control could play an influential role in hindering the people of Kūfa to support Imām.

Alluring was also applied by Ibn Ziyād in addition to threatening. Prior to people's departure, Ibn Ziyād told them, "in order to persuade you to prepare for battling against his foe, Yazīd has sent four thousand Dīnārs and two hundred thousand dhms to give you".[5]

People's reliance on financial generosity provoked a group of them to stand against Imām in Karbalā. When Imām conceived that people were in true intent on assassinating him, he affirmed, يا هؤلاء! إسمعوا يرحمكم الله، مالنا ولكم، ما هذا بكم يا أهل الكوفة؟ قالوا خفنا العطاء "Lo! What has occurred between you and us? O people of Kūfa! What has happened to you? They responded, "We fear the generosity." Imām added, ما عند الله من العطاء خير لكم[6] "Whatsoever is from Allāh is the best for you."

But no one heeded what Imām said.

The evidence so far is wholly to confirm this fact that a group of people including the distinguished and their adherents were all criminals who merited the abusiveness and harshness on the part of those reproaching them. Yet, concerning the specific despotism that predominated, there existed a large number who intended to join Imām but were not able to.

What Balādhurī has written appears appealing that Sa'd Ibn 'Ubayda was quoted as saying, "Standing on the hills, many a clergyman in Kūfa were praying, اللهم أنزل عليه نصرك "O Allāh reveals your aid to Ḥusayn."

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.263; Imām had already asked some of the Shi'ites distinguished in Baṣra for help in a letter, vol.IV, p.23.

[2] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, pp.173,179; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.295

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.180; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, pp.159,160

[4]. al-Muḥabbar, p.303

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.157

[6]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn of Ibn Sa'd, p.178

Sa'd added that he told them, يا أعداء الله ألا تنـزلون فتنصرونه "O Allāh's foes! Why don't you climb down to aid him?"[1]

Anyway, there is no doubt that Imām was martyred by the people of Kūfa while there was only one from Damascus among them.[2] Notwithstanding, the people of Kūfa should not be deemed as a single group.

Assessing the Travel to Iraq

Now, we ought to consider whether Imām's travel to Iraq was expedient or not in that situation. Regardless of the aspect of indivisibility of Karbalā event, here we are to assess Imām Ḥusayn's travel to Iraq politically in a few words. The first question raised is whether there was any other measure to be adopted for Imām other than travelling to Iraq and whether it could be anticipated that conducting such a revolution against Yazīd was feasible.

A deep glance at the existing historical sources will indicate the frequent objections voiced denoting that by no means had a travel to Iraq been expedient. The objections were from the very beginning. When people of Kūfa, subsequent to Imām Ḥasan's martyrdom, invited Imām Ḥusayn to that town, Imām replied that he would never consent to any revolution as long as Mu'āwiya was alive.[3] His justification might have been Iraq's inability to resist Mu'āwiya's tricks because they have already been tested in 'Alī's and Ḥasan's terms. Following Imām's opposition to the issue of allegiance and when Imām set out for Mecca, a travel to Iraq was probable. Quotedly, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Muṭī' forewarned Imām against his travel to Kūfa on the way from Medina to Mecca.[4]

When Imām entered Mecca, the objectors were innumerable. 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās suggested Imām to waive proceeding to Iraq and go to Yemen's mountains for preference due to various reasons as it is a mountainous area and more secure therein and that his fathers Shi'ite Muslims are abundant.[5] It was quoted by Ibn A'tham from Ibn Ḥanafiyya.[6]

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.226

[2]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.IV, p.28; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.61. (Even this one is not mentioned either).

[3]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, Ibn 'Asākir, p.197; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl pp.222-224

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, pp.36,37; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, pp.228,246; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.IV, p.19. on p.41 Imām's meeting with Ibn Muṭī' eroute from Mecca to Kūfa is referred.

[5]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.224; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.113; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.287; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.161; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.IV, p.39

[6]. Ibn A'tham, vol.V, p.32

"People are partial to Dīnār and Dirham which are both in the ruler's hands. Lest you might go to Iraq", said 'Amr Ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Hishām.[1] The objection raised by 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar was on account of his extreme fear of bloodshedding.[2] Touching upon his martyrdom in Iraq, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Dja'far had written, إني أخاف أن يطفيء نور الارض روح الهدى وأمير المؤمنين، فلا تعجل الى العراق فاني آخذ لك الامان من يزيد "I have a foreboding that the light of the earth will be extinguished as a result of your murder. The spirit of guidance and Amīr al-Mu'minīn is no one but you. Hasten not toward Iraq, I can seek quarter for you from Yazīd."[3]

Abū Sa'īd Khudrī is also quoted as saying, لا تخرج على امامك[4] "Never revolt against your Imām."

Miswar Ibn Makhrama who was among the protesters as well wrote to Imām, "Be not deluded by Iraqi people".[5] What Abū Wāqid Laythī had stated was like that of above.[6] Moving from Iraq to Ḥidjāz, Farazdaq opposed the travel.[7]

All of these objections plus some more are recorded in historical sources and many spiteful narrators might have been endeavoring to multiply them to substantiate that Imām had been truly deceived and traveled to Iraq with not a least rational reason. Prior to reflecting Imām's justification of why going to Iraq was requisite, it is worth presenting an introduction.

Political history shows that it rarely happened when a revolutionary man rose up politically he, in all probability, could foresee a definite triumph or an achievement of the goal with no peril. Those who struggle to assume a power either benevolently or malevolently always deal with a probability. In politics, even the most tiumphant and popular ones are invariably subjected to various probabilities of hardness and defeat. In no way should it be assumed that a movement be conducted with a high certainty. Such a notion is not only inconsistent with the historical realities, but also it is emanated from the simple-mindedness regarding the nature of political activities.

And now we ought not to presuppose that Imām should have inevitably had a high certainty to win in the travel. On the one hand, those who deemed Imām's travel inexpedient never must they notice the proof which

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.161; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.110; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.287

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.163; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.39; Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn of Ibn Sa'd, p.166

[3] Ibn A'tham, vol.V, p.116; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.291; Ibn Athīr, vol.IV, p.40

[4]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn of Ibn Sa'd, p. 167

[5]. Ibid. p. 167

[6]. Ibid. p.166

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.165

demonstrate the probable defeat; as an instance, the people of Kūfa had already been tested once. On the other hand, those who deemed it expedient neither should they suppose that there had been no probability of defeat. Taking them all into consideration, Imām Ḥusayn's position should be gauged in that situation first and then the travel to Iraq be evaluated considering both historical evidence and Imām's remarks.[1]

Imām by no means assented to Yazīd and his sovereignty no matter if it might have preceded his martyrdom. Nevertheless, he was seeking for an opportunity to rise up against Yazīd and secure the sovereignty. From the framework being made in Imām's mind one probability should have been preferably singled out and he should have naturally reacted to any suggestion or objection voiced. Since the plan was not flexible at all, any suggestion that could spoil it in any way was condemned on the part of Imām.

In such a situation, there existed particular specifications for the Islamic world politically. Imām had to adopt measures in such a way that he could under those circumstances achieve his goal successfully in a bid to defend the religion and establish a just government. In diverse levels were Imām's objectives. Procuring the rule could have been treated as a considerable victory for him having been thought of it. As the one enjoying the good and prohibiting the evil, he could have accomplished his mission even though his goal had become unattainable. Given that if he were not able to reach such an achievement he had no doubt that with his blood streamed he was able to irrigate the lofty tree of Islam and enlighten the nation as to the tough environment they live in.

The reality was that Yazīd never allowed anyone like Imām Ḥusayn who abstained from swearing allegiance to him to live at ease. Owing to the fact that Imām was not a man who lives calmly, Yazīd's only resort was to take his life in case he was not convinced to swear. Moreover, Damascus, Medina and Mecca in particular and Ḥidjāz in general were not the ones which could resist Yazīd having such an intention. Imām must have turned his attention to elsewhere. Although proceeding to Mecca seemed rational for the time being thanks to its sacred nature wherein his safeti was warranted for a short while, it could certainly not be a permanent refuge for him. Above all, Mecca was not on Imām's side and even in the course of allegiance to Amīr al-Mu'minīn, it swore with hesitation. At this juncture, the only place as a focal point of attention could be Iraq that was a center for Imām's Shi'ites Muslims. In different respects, it was a foe to Damascus as well. The demand made by Kūfa for Imām's travel reinforced the

---

[1]. As mentioned earlier, this matter is beyond the scholastic aspect of Imamate.

probability of victory. The more the invitation was stressed, the more the percentage of the probable victory was augmented.

Never does it mean that there was no jeopardy in Iraq. However, the question posed is that if Imām was set to settle in somewhere, where could he select? Was Imām Ḥusayn ever a man to swear allegiance? Or was Yazīd a man who permits him to survive without allegiance? If Imām had not gone to Iraq, would not the historians have written that if he had gone, he would have gained a victory? Would not they have inquired why he had not given a positive answer to the letters? How could he allow Yazīd's agents to martyr him in Ḥidjāz whereas he could take an action? These questions together with some more are the ones that would be raised by any wise individual were a travel to Kūfa not taken place.

What merits consideration is that the consequence of objector's demands for Imām's not going was approving Yazīd's sovereignty even if temporarily and never ever could it be practical for Imām. Accordingly, since seeking quarter from Yazīd that had been recommended by 'Abd Allāh Ibn Dja'far was on the condition that Imām swears allegiance to him it was on no accounts tolerable for Imām. Now let's take a glance at Imām's own response and how history has reflected it.

Among the points Imām (a) had been regularly hinting at was that Yazīd with his agents would in no way allow him to remain alive in Mecca and definitely they would murder him. In an answer to Ibn 'Abbās's objection, Imām stated, ان أقتل خارجاً منها بشبرين أحب الي من أقتل خارجاً منه بشبر "I would rather be killed two inches farther from Mecca than one inch farther."[1]

It highlights not only the reverence of Mecca had to be observed but also Imām's life was at risk and he should have taken an action. In reacting to Ibn 'Umar, Imām had asserted, انّ القوم لايتركوني ... فلا يزالون حتي أبايع واني كاره فيقتلونني[2] "This group will never stop insisting on swearing allegiance on my part. As I will never do so, they will kill me."

The situation wherein Imām was, is well-described in above utterance. Elsewhere Imām had made it clear, ولو كنت في جُحر هامة من هوام الأرض استخرجوني ويقتلوني[3] "Even though I hide in the hole of a desert animal, they will trace and murder me."

---

[1] Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.164; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.289; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.113; Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, the first Ibn 'Asākir, p.190; al-Ma'rifat wa l-tārikh, vol.I, p.541; Madjma' al-Zawā'id, vol.I, p.192; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.55; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.IV, p.38

[2]. loc.cit.

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.116; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.IV, p.38

When Imām was questioned why he hastened, he answered, لو لم أعجل لاخذت[1] "I will be arrested, unless I hasten."

Somewhere else he stated, إنّ بنى أميّة أخذوا مالي فصبرت، وشتموا عرضي فصبرت وطلبوا دمي فهربت[2] "The Umayya confiscated my properties. I had to tolerate, marred my reputation but I tolerated, when they decided to shed my blood, I had to flee."

All these narrations confirm that they were determined to take Imām's life and there was no hope of survival left provided that he contented to swear allegiance. The other side of the coin was traveling to Iraq. What spot should have been chosen by Imām?

In an interval between Sha'bān and Dhi l-Ḥadjdja when Imām lived in Mecca, he received many letters from Iraq. These letters were the ones which later turned into Imām's main reason for a travel to Iraq. Any time any objection to going was raised, Imām referred to the letters.[3] When Imām faced Ḥurr and when he was asked by 'Umar Ibn Sa'd why he came to Iraq, he reasoned those very letters.

Once Budjayr Ibn Shaddād asked Imām for the reason of going, he replied, هذه كتب وجوه أهل المصر[4] "These letters are all from the distinguished of this city."

'Āshūrā morning, he again referred to the letters.[5] He showed the letters to 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar too.[6] His response to any objection was, خلفي مملوءة بالكتب[7] "The sack on my horse is overflown with their letters."

This wide-ranging invitation was seemingly serious particularly because in addition to the mass ordinary people, the distinguished of Kūfa had written the greater number of letters, those whom people follow. This crowd included many other distinguished figures as well as the Shi'ite Muslims. Were it only formed by the Shi'ite Muslims, it would take little notice in light of the fact that the number of them was truly inconsiderable. It was solely its broadness that gave a serious shape to invitation.

Beyond the invitation were the results of two tests Kūfa had taken in the times of Imām 'Alī and Imām Ḥasan, in both of which they had failed. Which one should have been attended by Imām, their black record or their

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.290

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.124

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, pp.163-165

[4]. Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p.173

[5]. Ibid. p.181

[6]. Ibn 'Asākir,Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p. 192

[7]. Ibid. pp. 209, 210

present state? Regarding our previous remarks, if we assume that the probability of Imām's victory was less than fifty percent, there was no other altentive for him? It does appear that in normally political conditions there was no other way the probability of victory of which to be as equal as that in Kūfa, neither was there in Yemen if proceeding there. It was thanks to the fact that not only the Shi'ite Muslims in Yemen were never as many as those in Kūfa, but it was within the realm of Mu'āwiya as well. Even when Imām 'Alī's governor was there, an army invaded Yemen from Damascus and massacred the Shi'ite Muslims.

The fundamental reason of probable victory was the letters showing that not only a great number would guard him but also they would battle against his foe. Furthermore, nowhereelse did invite him. Those who wrote letters first were such Shi'ite Muslims as Sulaymān Ibn Ṣurad, Musayyib Ibn Nadjba, Ḥabīb Ibn Mazāhir, Rufā'a Ibn Shaddād and others. With a short opportunity available to Imām, he selected a way reasonably. At this stage, he let the letters unanswered inasmuch as Mecca was flooded with frequent letters. Besides, the representatives of the writers went to Mecca and offered their invitations personally. Any letter received in Mecca had many a name and signature at the bottom. According to a few narrations, the number of the letters had been one hundred and fifty. Notwithstanding, Imām gave no answer to them up to the end[1] but he only contented himself with dispatching Muslim.

To assess public support better, Imām dispatched an envoy, Muslim Ibn 'Aqīl who was trustworthy to Kūfa. In a letter he wrote to Kūfa, انی بعثت أخي وابن عمي وثقتي من أهل بيتي مسلم بن عقيل وقد أمرته أن يكتب الي بحالكم ورأيكم فقدموا مع ابن عمّي وبايعوه وانصروه[2] "I have sent my brother, my cousin and the most truthful in my family, Muslim Ibn 'Aqīl to you. I have demanded that he write about the conditions there to me. Help him and, swear allegiance to him."

After Muslim had entered the town, people swore allegiance to him group by group. Recording their names, he had them make a pledge to back Imām and not be treacherous. The recorded number was twenty thousand and more.[3] Muslim who found the situation well wrote to Imām Ḥusayn, فاني أخبرك أنه قد بايعك من الكوفة نيف وعشرون ألفا فاذا بلغك كتابي هذا فالعجل[4] "As soon as you

---

[1]. See, al-Futūḥ, vol.V, pp. 46, 49, 50, 51; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.262

[2]. See, al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.52; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.262

[3]. See, al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.68, see also Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 259; Ibn 'Asākir, Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, 207; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p54, (The number recorded was 12000); see also, al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.II, p.5 (The recorded number was 30000)

[4]. Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p.174; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.281; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.77

have received my letter, hurry for more than twenty thousand people who swore allegiance to you."

When Imām departed, he had received a letter informing that eighteen thousands in Kūfa have sworn allegiance to Muslim.[1]

What was Imām able to do upon receiving such a letter? In advance of dispatching Muslim, by no means was he certain. But now it was the letter his envoy had written and could be the evidence of people's to him. At the last stage reacting to Ibn 'Abbās's objection, Imām said, I know that your intention is naught except advising but, ولكن مسلم بن عقيل كتب الي باجتماع أهل المصر على بيعتي ونصرتي وقد أجمعت على المسير اليه[2] "Since Muslim has written to me that all have congregated to aid me and swear allegiance to me, I am decisive to travel."

In another narration, Muslim had written to Imām, والناس كلهم معك ليس لهم في آل معاوية رأي ولا هوى[3] "Everyone is with you and no one is attentive to Mu'āwiya's family."

It was exactly what Muslim had witnessed and reported. Although he had assuredly noticed public ignorance towards Mu'āwiya and their inclination to 'Alī's family, with Ibn Ziyād's arrival and black shade of his despotism the tables were turned. Threatening Kūfa was a serious affair for the Umayya. In a letter to Yazīd, spies wrote, قد بايع مسلم الترابية[4] "Turābiyya- a label given to Shi'ite Muslims after naming 'Alī as Abū Turāb- have all sworn allegiance to Muslim and entreated him to come to their rescue in Kūfa."

Dispatching 'Ubayd Allāh accounted for it. It had become totally overt that they would be deprived of Kūfa unless they make haste. Notably, when according to a narration Nu'mān Ibn Bashīr, in addition to his indifference, had stated, لابن بنت رسول الله أحب الينا من ابن بجدل[5] "Allāh's Messenger's descendant is more popular with us than Ibn Badjdal's[6] son."

As quoted by Ibn A'tham, in the course of Muslim's coming to Kūfa, Nu'mān was on his own in the palace. No one attended Friday prayers andP no one paid tax to him. Anyone whom he summoned did never care and anyone whom he commanded did not comply with.

---

[1]. Ibid. p. 174

[2]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, pp. 54, 55

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.281

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.281

[5]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.II, p.5.

[6]. Ibn Badjdal refers to Yazīd.

Imām Versus Iraqi Army

The ever-first army Imām encountered was a one-thousand- soldier army the head of which was Ḥurr Ibn Yazīd Riyāḥī; Then, Ḥurr was a subordinate commander at Ibn Ziyād's service and did not interfere in political affairs. By the same token on account the belief he enjoyed he along with his army performed his prayer led by Imām Ḥusayn. Ḥurr's accountability was to escort Imām to Kūfa and never allow him to return.

In a sermon delivered Imām addressed the worshippers as saying, "I had in no way intended to come here until your letters and message-carriers came to me. I will step into your town if you guarantee that no breach of promise will be made; otherwise, I return to where I came from".[1]

As already mentioned, as soon as Imām received Muslim's Letter, he left Mecca with all possible haste for Kūfa. Moving ahead was kept on until the news of Muslim's martyrdom spread. No sooner had the caravan learned it[2] than it slackened its pace and consequently exchange of views began among Imām, his household and the followers. It is alleged that Imām changed his mind about going onwards. Nonetheless, Muslim's brothers were not convinced but decisive to retaliate.[3] If presumably they had had such an intention, they must have been definitely hopeful about the victory. And it might have influenced Imām to become apparently persuaded to proceed. It is hardly rational to assume that they sought revenge for their brother's murder while being certain of their defeat. There existed another matter apart from political victory and it was the fact that Imām Ḥusayn should have taken a stance on Mu'āwiya after all even though it cost his martyrdom and to his eye this kind of martyrdom was equated with condemning Yazīd. To confirm the probability of victory, many might have made some remarks.

Quotedly a number said, "You and Muslim Ibn 'Aqīl are not alike. Upon seeing you, the people of Kūfa will warmly welcome you".[4]

They meant that perhaps Muslim could not accomplish to prompt people for whatever reason but his personality will unequivocally captivate them. In view of all letters and ten-year requests on the part of Kūfa, never did it seem unlikely. Accordingly Imām consented to keep on.

---

[1]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, see also Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.170; Al Futūḥ, vol.V, p.135

[2]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.247 it is narrated that two people belonging to Banū Asad who were coming from Kūfa informed them. That the one giving the news of Muslim's martyrdom was either Farazdaq or Ḥurr is not true. See Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.61; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.125.

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.168; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.292;Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p.176; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.II, p.6

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.300; al-Kāmil fī l-tārīkh, vol.IV, p.42

In consistent with a narration in al-Futūḥ, the letter sent by Imām through Qays Ibn Musahhar for urging Kūfa to observe their commitment[1] had been possibly after being informed of Muslim's martyrdom though doubt about Kūfa had been remarkably prevailed in Imām's army its impact on returning was uncovered only when it encountered Ḥurr's army. The coming of Ḥurr together with his army, hearing that enemy's four-thousand-soldier army being enroute to Qādisiyya as well as the previous news from Kūfa given by Ibn Sa'd's envoy about Muslim's recommendation all propelled Imām to disregard going to Kūfa. Being arrested and noticing how people left him alone, Muslim tried to dissuade him from coming at all costs with a message as he had already tried to persuade him. He had appealed to 'Umar Ibn Sa'd for leaving his message to Imām.

A while after receiving the message in early Muḥarram, Imām's caravan encountered Ḥurr's army in Iraq. Although Imām was set to return, Ḥurr impeded him, for his duty was to escort Imām to Kūfa. Imām who had become aware of the real status in Kūfa, rejected his request. In order to refrain from any clash for which he had no mandate, he decided to lead the army towards Karbalā, an arid land, in lieu of Ḥidjāz or Kūfa.[2] Heedless of what was adopted practically, Imām propounded the matter of returning when meeting Ḥurr and demanded him to allow them to return.[3] Once more he repeated the same proposal to Ibn Sa'd later,[4] and frequently he stated, يا أيها الناس إذا كرهتموني فدعوني أنصرف عنكم إلى مأمني الأرض "O people! If you are reluctant to support me, at least let me return to the secure land, Mecca."[5]

As narrated by a number of historians, Imām's suggestions were three, Returning to Ḥidjāz, Damascus or to oriental land of Islam, on the outskirts of the Islamic land. The tradition just mentioned in addition to others all manifest that Imām requested to only return to Ḥidjāz, either Mecca or Medina, not to Damascus. Balādhurī has stipulated that his insistence was only on returning to Medina when seeing 'Umar Ibn Sa'd.[6] It has been also quoted from 'Uqba Ibn Sam'ān supportedly as saying, "Contrary to popular belief under no circumstances did Imām ask permission to visit Yazīd and swear allegiance to him though I was beside him at all times. What he urged was, دعوني أرجع إلى مكان الذي أقبلت منه، أو دعوني أذهب في هذه الأرض العريضة حتى تنظر الى ما

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.304

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.170; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.139; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.IV, pp.47, 48

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.170; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.135; Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.250

[4]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.311; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.155

[5]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.323

[6]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.II, p.182

يصير اليه أمر الناس[1] "Let me either return where I came from or live in this extensive land to find out what the destiny of such people would be."

According to Balādhurī Imām appealed to Ḥurr for permitting him to go to Damascus and swear allegiance to Yazīd. [2] It is as plain as day that Imām endured such sufferings as the homelessness for the sake of not swearing allegiance to Yazīd, and were this narration genuine supposedly, it could never be interpreted as corroborating Yazīd's caliphate, but in all probability as keeping away from Ibn Ziyād's realm who was a libertine and bold man. Imām was certain that his not swearing allegiance would prompt Yazīd to assassinate him; therefore, it seemed irrational to go to Damascus intentionally.

Yazīd personally had written to Walīd, وليكن جوابك إليّ رأس الحسين[3] "Your response to me has to be Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī's head."

Walīd detested to murder him in person and later on he expressed regret on Imām's martyrdom.[4] It is by no means admissible that even if Imām had made such a remark, his aim could have been swearing allegiance or proceeding to Damascus at all.

When Imām for the purpose of enlightening Ḥurr refereed to the pile of letters from Kūfa as the motivation of his travel, Ḥurr was totally unaware of the letters. After the letters were all displayed, he again pointed out that he was duty-bound to take them to Kūfa. Imām who was never ever convinced to go to Kūfa took the route of Ḥidjāz.[5] Ḥurr's army blocked his way then. They compromised to take a midway neither to Ḥidjāz nor to Kūfa but to the area of al-'Udhayb.[6]

It was this point where Ṭirimmāḥ Ibn 'Adī proposed Imām to go towards Ṭayy mountains but on account of the presence of Ḥurr's army and the agreement they had reached, Imām refused it[7].On his way Imām made an attempt to switch to way to the desert and keep as far away from Kūfa as possible. Ḥurr was regularly the one who prevented him until they arrived at

---

[1]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.IV, p.54

[2]. Ibid. p.173; in footnote, this tradition is declared untrue by Editor.

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.26

[4]. Ibn Sa'd,Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p.192

[5]. Ibid. p.250

[6]. Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p.250; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, pp.130, 141; vol.II, p.170

[7]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.307; Balādhurī, vol.II, p.173 the tribe of Banū Ṭayy was the tribe of Ḥātam Ṭāyī whose son, Adi, was from among the Prophet's and later 'Alī's companions and now his son, Ṭirimmāḥ, made such a suggestion for his Shī'ism.

Banū Muqātil's palace and then Naynawā.[1] Exactly it was here where the command of ceasing was received by Ḥurr from Ibn Ziyād, و لا تحلّه إلا بالعراء على غير خضر ولا ماء[2] "Keep him awaiting solely in an arid desert."

Here a number of the Shi'ite Muslims of Kūfa could join Imām and despite Ḥurr's opposition remained beside him.[3]

While Ḥurr was with Imām, Zubayr Ibn Qayn suggested Imām to attack them who were few then. Declining Imām affirmed, إني اكره أن أبدنهم بالقتال[4] "I loathe to be the one who wages war."

Arriving in Karbalā coincided with the second of Muḥarram, Wednesday or Thursday. According to Dīnwarī, Muḥarram 1st was the day of arriving in Karbalā.[5]

As written by Mas'ūdī, when Imām arrived in Karbalā, five hundred cavalrymen and one hundred infantrymen were accompanying him.[6] During the eight-day period and above all on the eve of 'Āshūrā, the day after which war would undoubtedly break out, these men turned their back on Imām. Although the number of whom at that night might have been fewer than that reported by Mas'ūdī, beyond any question a number left Imām an his own at this interval.

The day after Imām's arrival in Karbalā, Ibn Ziyād's troops were gradually deployed to this land. All tribes were group by group dispatched to the spot due to the fact that Ibn Ziyād insisted that each one of Kūfa participate in the process. Such a policy was to hinder a few tribes to be accused later and to try to make all have a hand in Imām's murder and it could be a hindrance to the people of Kūfa to engage in any movement in 'Alawites' favor. Those having been dispatched were some twenty two thousand according to Ibn A'tham[7] although Balādhurī,[8] Dīnwarī[9] as well as Ibn Sa'd have described that some had fled halfway.

---

1. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, pp.250, 251

2. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.176;Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.251

3. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.172

4. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.252

5. Ibid. p.253

6. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.61

7. Ḥurr with one thousand, Ḥuṣayn Ibn Numayr with tour thousand, Shabath Ibn Rib'ī with one thousand, Shimr Ibn Dhi l-Djawshan with four thousand, ...; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.159

8. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.179

9. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.254

In view of the fact that Ibn Ziyād had announced, أيما رجل وجدناه بعد يومنا هذا متخلفاً عن العسكر برئت منه الذمة[1] "Anyone who abstains from joining the army, from today onwards, will in no way be protected by me."

And this menace was what made the crowd set out to Karbalā.

'Umar Ibn Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ was due to proceed to Riy and do battle with Daylamān, a polytheist; however, it was resolved to move to Riy after finalizing the plan in Karbalā. As the commander of Kūfiyān troops in spite of his and Banū Zuhra's[2] reluctance, he eventually opted the governorship of Riy in return for streaming Imām's blood and then went to Karbalā.[3]

At first Ibn Sa'd sent an envoy to Imām to ask for the ground of his coming. Imām who refereed to the letters received from Kūfa stated that if they had retracted, he would return where he had come from. Seeking refuge, 'Umar Ibn Sa'd reported the suggestion to Ibn Ziyād, "Ḥusayn has made a pledge to either return or go to one of the extremities of Islamic land and live a quiet life and it is satisfactory for you and is for the good of the nation, هذا لك رضا وللأمة صلاح[4] "Nevertheless, Shimr tried to dissuade Ibn Ziyād willing to accept the suggestion and told him that if he let Ḥusayn go, under no conditions could he be found any more."

Ibn Ziyād in a letter to Ibn Sa'd wrote, "I have not sent you to condescend but to secure allegiance for Yazīd presently. If he refrained, take his life".[5]

As soon as receiving the message, Imām stressed, لا أجيب ابن زياد، لا ذلك ابداً، فهل هو إلا الموت فمرحباً به[6] "Never ever will I reply Ibn Ziyād's proposal in affirmative. Will there be any other consequence save demise? Demise is very welcomed, however."

A couple of days to 'Āshūrā, Ibn Ziyād commanded emphatically to keep water beyond Imām Ḥusayn's reach, حل بين الحسين والماء فلا يذوقوا منه قطرة كما منع بالتقي الزكي عثمان[7] "Keep him far away from water so that he cannot take a drop as they did so to 'Uthmān."

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.178

[2]. Sharaf al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p.178

[3]. Imām sent an envoy to dissuade Ibn Sa'd but the response given to him was رفي ابن سعد أن يقتلك بملك اسري Ibn Sa'd to battle against you in return Riy. Al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.173

[4]. al-Irshād, p.229

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.166; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III,, p.183 فانظر فإن نزل الحسين واصحابه على الحكم فابعث بهم الي سلما وإن أبوا فازحف إليهم حتى تقتلهم وتمثل بهم فانهم مستحقون لذلك

[6]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.254

[7]. This order was given three days after Imām's arrival. See also, Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.255; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.180, what Ibn Ziyād has stated about 'Uthmān was on

He also had written to Ibn Sa'd, "I have learned that Ḥusayn with his companions have sunk wells and water is within reach. Upon receiving the letter, stop their digging as far as possible and by no means allow them to consume the water of the Euphrates."[1]

During the last days Imām had some clandestine meetings with Ibn Sa'd attempting to dissuade him. Yet as demonstrated by historical narration's he could in no way disregard the governorship of Riy.

Shimr due to consanguinity he had with 'Abbās Ibn 'Alī's mother, made Ibn Ziyād to write guarantee of clemency to him as well as his brothers. Under no circumstances were they able to be prevailed upon to leave Imām Ḥusayn alone.[2]In another case a guarantee of clemency is reported for 'Alī Akbar and it was also for the sake of his mother. 'Alī Akbar had asserted, أما والله لقرابة رسول الله (ص) أولى أن ترعى من قرابة أبي سفيان[3] "Deferring to consanguinity with the Prophet (s) is more superior than that with Abū Sufyān."

Ibn Ziyād who was determined to attack in the evening of Tāsū'ā (the ninth day of the month of Muḥarram) admitted to procrastinate it till tomorrow at the request of Imām. At night Imām made some remarks to his companions. He declared that he ignored their allegiance, they are free to leave and they can take a few members of his family with them as well. However, companions did announce their steadfastness.[4]

On the eve of 'Āshūrā, Imām commanded to dig out trenches all around the tents but one side to avert the enemy's attacks from all sides. From early morning of 'Āshūrā, both armies arrayed against one another. No imperfection could be noticed in Imām's army. Without consideration of facts, divine predestination or the political privileges of which subsequent to Imām Ḥusayn's martyrdom, taking the household with him exposes to view the intention Imām had had for procuring Yazīd the sovereignty. Even their transferring from Mecca to Kūfa had seemingly originated from political certainty and it was the submission of Kūfa to Imām. Accordingly their staying in Ḥidjāz was never politically expedient in view of the fact that it

---

no accounts true because when 'Uthmān was under opponents' pressure, it was Imām 'Alī (a) who provide water for him. Earlier, we have discussed this in this regard.

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.162; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.311. Reaction to some objections as saying because with digging two or three metersof water could be found in Karbalā and there was no need for the water of the Euphrates; there fore, no one suffered from thirst. It is absolutely evident that Ibn Ziyād's army was so ruthless that it did not allow them to sink wells. Nevertheless, Imām's army could take water from the Euphrates several times until a couple of days prior to Āshūrā.

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.184; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.168

[3]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p.182

[4]. Ibn Sa'd,Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn,, p.178; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.IV, pp.58,59

could be envisioned how the Umayya would behave towards them following securing Arabia Pertae if the victory were supposedly gained in Iraq.

On the eve of ʻĀshūrā Imām addressed his companions as saying, "Tomorrow there shall be naught but martyrdom, فانتم في حل مني وهذا الليل قد غشيكم، فمن كانت له منم قوة فليضم رجلاً من أهل بيتي اليه وتفرقوا في سوادكم، فعسى الله أن يأتي بالفتح أو أمر من عنده فيصبحوا على ما اسرّوا في انفسهم نادمين[1] "You are all at liberty and it is the night at which you feel secure. Any of you who is more courageous can take one from my household with him and abandon so that Allāh can either grant us the triumph or adopt another measure to deter them from materializing their plan."

It is alluded here that it was probable for them to gain victory or for the foes to change their minds although such a probability did never appear politically strong. Under such circumstances, there existed no other alternative other than martyrdom. Ḥurr's as well as thirty individuals' joining to Imām[2] in addition to political broad-mindedness on the part of Imām in ʻĀshūrā morning both implied that such a development was not beyond the bounds of possibility. Not withstanding ʻUmar Ibn Saʻd's villainous nature whose father was among the Qā'idīn[3], the malice fo such Khāridjites-featured individuals as Shimr Ibn Dhi l-Djawshan[4] along with the pressure exerted by Ibn Ziyād altogether engendered one of the most gruesome felony in the Islamic world.

Imām's army as narrated by Ibn Saʻd, included fifty men but later twenty others joined him.[5] Prior to the clashes, Imām delivered a speech to the opposite army, "Thanks to the request of you and others I came here. You had written that the Prophet's Sunna (tradition) was being neglected and discord was being sown. My coming here was at your demand to guide my forefather's Umma (nation). If now you feel disinclined, allow me return at least. Think twice! Do you ever consider shedding the blood of the Holy Prophet's son legitimate? The son of Prophet's cousin who was the ever first believer? The one whose uncles were Ḥamza, ʻAbbās and Djaʻfar? Have you ever not heard how the Prophet (s) had characterized my brother and me as, سيدا شباب أهل الجنّة "They both are the masters of the youth in Heaven."

---

[1]. Ibn Saʻd,Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, pp. 179, 180

[2]. Ibid. pp. 178, 181; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.II, p.7

[3]. Those who had been described well by Imām ʻAlī (a) as

خذلوا الحق و لم ينصروا الباطل

They have not only forgotten the gospel truth but also they never back the credal error

[4]. Notorious of being Khāridjites

[5]. Ibn Saʻd,Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn,, p.178

Question Djābir Anṣārī, Abū Sa'īd Khudrī and Zayd Ibn Arqam if you do not believe me".[1]

The reasoning Ibn Ḥuḍayr had refereed to are like those mentioned.[2] Zuhayr Ibn Qayn, a renowned figure, pronounced an ultimatum as well.[3]

So for presuming that it might never be culminated in blood letting not least streaming the blood of Allāh's Messenger's son, Ḥurr Ibn Yazīd perceived the reality all at once.

He went to Ibn Sa'd asking, "Was none of his remarks convincing for you?"

"I would never murder him if I could," 'Umar Ibn Sa'd responded, "now there is no other alternative."

Upon hearing such comments, Ḥurr without delay went to Imām, begged for forgiveness, stood to defend him and ultimately after killing two people achieved martyrdom.[4] Among the ones who allied themselves with Imām and became martyred was Yazīd Ibn Abī Ziyād, too.[5]

Since it was by no means Imām 'Alī's approach to be the beginner of the war, Imām also was not the one who commenced it in Karbalā. It was 'Umar Ibn Sa'd who put on arrow in his bow and shot at Imām's army first. And afterwards he announced that they should wear witness to Ibn Ziyād that he was the first shooter.[6]

When the battle started, the members of Imām's army went to the battlefield one by one. After a while the enemy's death toll had risen to more than the martyrs. Therefore, touching upon the fact that they were combating Arab heroes, 'Amr Ibn Ḥadjdjādj forewarned, "You will all be slaughtered unless you put them under a rain of arrows".[7] Under a heavy barrage of arrows and in the course of several clashes, Imām's adherents and the members of his household were martyred respectively. The details of the conflict have been inscribed by a number as inscribed by Ibn Sa'd in Ṭabaqāt. Eventually the event of Karbalā, resulting in martyring Imām and

---

[1]. Ibn Sa'd,Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p.181. see also al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.IV, pp. 60, 61

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.182

[3]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.IV, p. 63

[4]. Ibid. vol.IV, pp. 64-65

[5]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.IV, p. 73

[6]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.326; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.183

[7]. Tarkih Ṭārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 331; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.IV, p.67

more than seventy of his followers and killing some eighty eight people of the opposite army, came to an end.[1]

THE ELEMENT OF INVISIBILITY IN KARBALĀ

Among the factors that have played pivotal roles in the historical dimension of ideological epic in Karbalā is the element of "invisibility". This very element is what not merely has created friction in analyzing this historical event but has contrasted a subject in scholastic theology with a historical one. There are many narrations in this regard in most of which Allāh's Messenger has foretold Imām Ḥusayn's martyrdom. 'Allama Amīnī has compiled a number of such narrations in Sīratanā wa Sunnatanā. Moreover, they can be found innumerably in Sunnites books.

In addition to[2] these narrations which are historical by themselves, there are other ones having explicitly or implicitly predicted the incident in Karbalā. Below we present some adapted from the historical books.

As recounted, a night before emigrating from Medina to Mecca, when Imām went to pay a visit to the Prophet's tomb, he fell asleep. He dreamed about the Holy Prophet together with a group of angels. Hugging him, the Prophet stated, يا حسين! كأنك عن قريب أراك مقتولاً مذبوحاً بأرض كرب وبلا من عصابة من أمتي وأنت في ذلك عطشان لا تسقى... يا حسين إن أباك وأمك قد قدموا عليَّ وهم اليك مشتاقون وأن لك في الجنة درجات لن تنالها الا بالشهادة "O Ḥusayn! I foresee that in a near future you will be killed by a group from my Umma in Karbalā while thirsty.... O Ḥusayn! Your parents who are both with me are looking forward to meeting you. A rank is determined for you in Paradise to which you can reach merely through martyrdom."

According to another narration, Imām Ḥusayn (a) had stated in Mecca, انّي رأيت جدي (ص) في منامي وقد أمروني بأمر وأنا ماض لأمره[3] "I had a dream about my forefather. He commanded something for implementing which I am going."

On the strength of this very dream Imām wrote a letter to Sa'īd Ibn 'Āṣ saying, وأعلمك انّي رأيت جدي في منامي مخبرني بأمر وأنا ماض له[4] "I inform you that I had a dream about my forefather. Since he notified me of something I am seeking for."

---

[1]. Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p.184; see also Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.63. It has been the true historical narration and consistent with the status quo at that time and the mutual manners.

[2]. See Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, pp.154-161 and the footnotes of the pages.

[3]. Ibid. vol.V, p.51

[4]. Ibid. vol.V, p.116; see also Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.291, he had written the same to 'Abd Allāh Ibn Dja'far as well. See also Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p. 202

In Khuzaymiyya, Zaynab (s) came to Imām and said, "At midnight I heard a yell, What was it?" Imām inquired. She replied "An invisible speaker was yelling out,

ألا يا عيـــن فاحتفلي بجهد ومن يبكي علي الشهداء بعدي
على قـــوم تسوقهم المنايا بمقدار الـــي انجـــاز وعـــدي

"O eye! Rejoice as much as you can. Who shall shed tears for the martyrs after me? Death is approaching this tribe in order to make my vow unconditional."

"Whatsoever Allāh has foreordained will assuredly materialize", Imām stressed.[1]

Others are when Imām arrived in Karbalā. After he asked what the area was called, he stated, لقد مرّ أبي بهذا المكان عند مسيره الى صفين وأنا معه فوقف فسأل عنه فأخبر باسمه؛ فقال ها هنا محطّ ركابهم وها هنا مهراق دمائهم، فسئل عن ذلك، فقال: ثقل لآل بيت محمد ينـــزلون هاهنا[2] "Once my father on his way to Ṣiffīn asked the name of this area. When he was answered and while I was with him, he expressed that here would be where they would dismount and their blood would be shed. Being asked, he replied that a group from the Prophet's Ahl al-Bayt would dismount here."

It was in the afternoon when Imām in Tha'labiyya lay down and fell asleep. As soon as he woke up he began sobbing. After 'Alī Akbar asked the reason, he said, انّي رأيت فارساً على فرس حتى وقف عليّ فقال: يا حسين! انّكم تسرعون المسير والمنايا لكم تسرع الي الجنّة. فعلمت أن أنفسنا قد نعيت الينا[3] "There was a man on horseback who came nearer and stopped before us saying, "O Ḥusayn! The fast you are proceeding on this way, the fast your death is moving towards Paradise," I realized that our souls are bidding farewell to us."

In 'Āshūrā morning, Imām told his sister, يا أختاهْ اني رأيت جدي في المنام وأبي علياً وفاطمة أمي وأخي الحسن عليهم السلام فقالوا: انّك رائح الينا عن قريب وقد والله يا أختاه دنا الامر في ذلك لا شك[4] "O sister! Last night my forefather, my father 'Alī, my mother Fāṭima and my brother, Ḥasan, were all in my dream saying that I will join them soon. O sister! By Almighty Allāh and beyond any doubt the time is ripe."

Concerning the eve of 'Āshūrā, it is quoted from Imām as stating that he had a dream about the Holy Prophet along with a number of his companions who had said, يا بني! أنت شهيد آل محمد وقد استبشرت بك السماوات وأهل الصفح الاعلى فليكن افطارك عندي الليلة تعجل ولا تؤخر[5] "O my son! A martyr of Muḥammad's family is

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.122

[2]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.253

[3]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p.177; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.123

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, pp. 175-176

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p.181

you. The heavens and the dwellers of the lofty heavens have given you glad tidings. Tonight you are supposed to break your fast beside me, so hasten."

Elsewhere Mudjāhid has narrated from Amīr al-Mu'minīn delivering a sermon in Kūfa, كيف أنتم اذا أتاكم أهل بيت نبيكم يحمل قويهم ضعيفهم "What will you do if you see your Prophet's household while the stronger one carries the weaker one."

"We will do so and so", the audience responded.

Shaking his head, Imām added, تواردن ثم تعرّدون ثم تطيعون البراءة ولابراءة لكم[1] "You accept and then change your mind. You prefer to disgust whereas you are not disgusted."

These examples all imply Imām's knowledge about the event in Karbalā previous to his martyrdom. Notwithstanding, it is by all means natural that neither Imām Husayn, nor the Prophet manipulated the factor of invisibility in their political lives. Except the time of substantiating the fact of Prophethood and Imāmat, the Prophet's and the twelve Imāms' conduct was compatible with the existing political evaluation. This kind of Divine knowledge was what they have been informed by Allāh through distinct ways either by Gabriel, in a dream or alike owing to the fact that the principle of invisibility is beyond all's power but Allāh's. Deeming the Prophet (s) as well as Imāms' role models and vanguards is founded on the existing state and ostensible evaluation not the unseen. It has been the policy of all the prophets and Imāms in their natural lives. In this respect many historical and scholastic analyses are done but they are beyond the capacity of this concise book and require an independent study.

THE ROLE OF RELIGIOUS DEVIATIONS IN KARBALĀ EVENT

The Islamic community in the year the event of Karbalā took place, had greatly differed from that in the last year of Prophet's life. The trend of deviation has been however gradual, according to many of researchers, the basis thereof was established from the first years after the Prophet's departure. The foregoing deviations were in such a way that the politicians could avail themselves of them to not only delude the people but also justify their despotism. The ones who played a crucial role in the origination and the development of such deviations were the Umayyads. The power notably secured by Yazīd revealed the fact that neverever had the Umayya believed in a genuine Islam and their belief was merely a covering people had spread in order to justify and concede their sovereignty.

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. IV, p.82

Having accused the Umayya of oppression and enmity,[1] Imām Ḥusayn (a) had described them as those who "obey Satan, disobey Allāh, propagate misdeeds, disregard Allāh's specified rules and also encrouch upon Bayt al-Māl (public treasury)".[2] In addition to creating corruption and ignoring divine limits, they had distorted a large number of religious concepts and misused them. Here let's discuss a few of them which had impacts in the course of Karbalā according to historical evidence.

"Obedience to Imāms, the necessity of Community and unlawfulness of breach of allegiance was three common political terms used by caliphs. It may be claimed that the above-mentioned terms could have guaranteed the base and the persistence of the caliphate. Anyhow, these three terms were right principles among the religious, political and Islamic concepts of which observing for the sake of the community was reasonably incumbent. Obeying an Imām denotes obeying the ruling system. The question raised is that to what extent the ruler should be complied with. Is it imperative that a just Imām be followed or an unjust monarch ought to be obeyed too? Earlier we discussed it in detail while considering 'Uthmān's caliphate.

Upholding Community implies avoiding disturbance or taking no action to undermine the unity or pave the ground for the emergence of a shaky Islamic community. The considerable question is whether silence should be kept before despotic monarchism or a libertine ruler under any circumstances in other words, should any objection be suppressed relying on the fact that it spoils "Community" and causes "disunion"?

Unlawfulness of breach of allegiance, namely fulfilling a pledge is heavily underlined in Islam. Since breaking a pledge or an allegiance is prohibited seriously, it stands to reason how much the role of which in political affairs can be positive. But if the allegiance were not sworn to caliphs like Yazīd or it were breached and consequently Community was spoiled, would it again follow the principle of unlawfulness of breach of allegiance or would it basically be an exception to the rule? As already alluded to the Umayya caliphs and later those of Banū 'Abbās by manipulating such concepts, however distorted and unconditional, compelled the people to acquiesce their sovereignty.

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p. 137

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p. 171; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, pp. 144-15; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.304; elsewhere, Imām had stated, الا ترون أن الحق لا يعمل به وأن الباطل لا يتناهي عنـــه Not you see how the gospel is not practiced but the credal error is endlessly practiced?

Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.305; Ibn 'Asākir, Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn,p. 214. Also Imām had said, فان السنة قد أميتت وان البدعة قـــد أحييـــت The Prophet's Sunnah is dissolved while heresies are revived

Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 266

After Mu'āwiya had secured allegiance for his son, Yazīd, he went to Medina to coerce the opponents to swear. 'Āyisha was among in view of the fact that his brother, Muḥammad Ibn Abū Bakr, had been martyred by Mu'āwiya.

When the issue of allegiance was propounded, Mu'āwiya told her, "I have secured allegiance for Yazīd from all Muslims, if you will, اني لا أري ذلك ولكن عليك بالرفق والتأني "Never do I pronounce it lawful but act moderately toward people instead."[1]

This case in point demonstrates how 'Āyisha was ever convinced. Let's consider one other instance. As stated by Ibn Isḥāq, they were doing prayers (perhaps in al-Ḥarām mosque) they noticed that Shimr Ibn Dhi l-Djawshan, being with them, had raised his hands saying "O Allāh! You are well-aware of my nobleness, so forgive me."

"I told him, added Ibn Isḥāq, how could you ever be forgiven whereas you have aided and abetted in murdering the Prophet's son?"

"What have we preformed?" Shimr reacted.

"It was the mandates of our commanders and we could in no way defy them". If disobeyed, كنا شراً من هذه الحمر السقا[2] "We would be far more inferior to water carrier beasts."

Apprehending him, Ibn Ziyād told Muslim Ibn 'Aqīl, يا شاق! خرجت علي امامك وشققت عصا المسلمين[3] "O outlaw! You have seceded from your Imām and have sowed the seeds of discord among Muslims."

Muslim who never yielded to such a digression, riposted that Mu'āwiya not only did not procure the caliphate through the consensus of opinions of the nation at all, but he overcame the Holy Prophet's successor through deception and usurped his caliphate.

When Imāim Ḥusayn was about to leave Mecca, the deputies of 'Amr Ibn Sa'īd Ibn 'Āṣ, the governor, said, الا تتقي الله تخرج عن الجماعة بين هذه الامّه[4] "Do you not fear from Allāh for seceding from the Muslim congregation and for causing disunion among the nation?"

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.IV, p. 237; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p. 183

[2]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p.197; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, Lisān al-mīzān, vol.III, p.151 (Al-Ḥumayr al-saqqā'āt)

[3]. al-Futūḥ, bol.5, p.98

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 289; such adverse publicity had made, the majority of people specially those from Damascus to consider Imām Ḥusayn as an outsider (the one seceding) and to accuse him of heresy.

"We have neverever ignored disobeying Imām, nor have we seceded from Community" affirmed 'Amr Ibn Ḥadjdjādj, a commander of Ibn Ziyād's.[1]

Advising Ibn Ziyād's army, he added, ألزموا طاعتكم وجماعتكم ولاترتابوا في قتل من مرق عن الدين وخالف الامام[2] "Not ever fail to remember obedience and union and at no time do you doubt about killing the one seceding from the religion and being at variance with Imām (ruler)."

Figures like 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar who was among the Sunnites religious jurisprudents and hadith-narrators, had imagined that if entire people acquiesced to swear the oath of allegiance to Yazīd, they would consent too.

He had given his assurance to Mu'āwiya, فاذا اجتمع النّاس على ابنك يزيد لم أخالف[3] "I shall oppose you unless people all swear allegiance to your son, Yazīd. He also had addressed Imām as saying, "Do cause not disunion among Muslims!"[4]

Such individuals as 'Umar and 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Awf's daughter had written to Imām to regard obedience with reverence and treat Community and its upholding as urgent.[5]

Another religious deviation in the Islamic community was "belief in fatalism". Previous to the event of Karbalā this belief has been misused. In Early Islamic Era, however, Mu'āwiya had been the reviver of which or according to Abū Hilāl 'Askarī he was the initiator of which.[6] Referring to the fact that Mu'āwiya is the founder of "fatalism", Qāḍī 'Abd al-Djabbār has quoted Mu'āwiya making as remarkable remarks[7] as follows, ان أمر يزيد قضاء من القضاء وليس للقضاء الخيرة من أمرهم[8] "This matter concerning Yazīd is a destiny from among Divine destinies and no one has any volition in this regard."

'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād asked Imām Sadjdjād (a), أو لم يقتل الله عليّاً؟ "Was Allāh not the One who killed 'Alī Akbar?"

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, p. 275

[2]. Ibid. p. 331

[3]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p. 167, as described by Mu'āwiya, Ibn 'Umar was a coward (Ibn A'tham, vol.IV, p. 260). He advised Imām Ḥusayn saying "Do not rise up, be patient, compromise as others did. See also al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p. 39; Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p. 166.

[4]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.IV, p. 17

[5]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p. 167

[6]. al-Awā'il, Askarī, vol.II, p. 125

[7]. Faḍl al-I'tizāl wa ṭabaqāt al-mu'tazila, p. 143

[8]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, pp. 183, 187

Imām's response was, كان لي أخ يقال له علي، اكبر مني قتله الناس "I had an elder brother whom people killed."[1]

Once 'Umar Ibn Sa'd was objected why he killed Imām Ḥusayn solely for the sake of Riy governorship, he replied that such an affair had been predestined.[2]

When alive, Ka'b al-Aḥbār had been foretelling that under no conditions would authority be secured by the Hāshimites, (although later both the 'Abbāsids and 'Alawites could secure it as an instance in Ṭabaristān). It has been quoted from 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar as well, as saying, فاذا رأيت الهاشمي قد ملك الزمان فقد هلك الزمان[3] "Any time you realized that one from the Hāshimites has secured the authority, conclude that it is that end of the world."

The consequences of these kinds of deviations for the future generations were that Imām Ḥusayn's movement has never been considered as an uprising against immorality in Sunnism but an illegal insurgency.[4]

POLITICAL IMPACTS OF THE EVENT OF KARBALĀ ON SHI'ISM

The event of Karbalā is among the determining incidents in the process of Shi'ites genesis in history. It was ealier mentioned that Shi'ism theories in general and its most elementary principle namely Imāmat in particular can thoroughly be traced in the Holy Qur'ān and Sunna both. Notwithstanding, the historical separation of Shi'ite Muslims from the other existing parties occurred quite gradually. Both lifestyle and the ideas left as memorials from Imām 'Alī's caliphate could to much extent cohere Shi'ism intellectually. The Umayya advocating their self-fabricated Islam the nature and the discrepancy of which from the authentic Islam never revealed by Mu'āwiya's policies could evidently be unveiled in the course of Yazīd's caliphate. Throughout the vent of Karbalā, the historical separation of Shi'ite Muslims from others affected by the Islam backed by the Umayya finalized. From then onwards, distinguishing Shi'ite Muslims as the followers of Sunna, 'Alī and his successors seemed truly a simple task.

Amongst the Shi'ite Muslims there, existed a number who were from all standpoint followers of Imām and regarded them as the Prophet's successors elected by him. The limit of Shi'ism, on the other hand, on the part of other

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p. 188

[2]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.V, p. 148

[3]. Ibn 'Asākir,Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, p. 193

[4]. Tārikh Islām, Cambridge University, vol.I, p. 81 (Englisht text); See also al-Ikhtilāf fī l-lafẓ, pp. 47-49

groups from Iraq, etc was only the superiority they believed for 'Alawites over Umayyads.[1] Those who achieved martyrdom beside Imām Ḥusayn in Karbalā were among the Shi'ite Muslims describing Imamate as the only prerogative of 'Alī and his descendants. Imām himself on various occasions had frequently recommended people to leave the right to the rightful and contribute to him as well. The Umayyads were in truth the usurpers this very right.[2] Somewhere he had stated, أيها الناس أنا ابن بنت رسول الله ونحن أولى بولاية هذه الامور عليكم من هولاء المدعين ما ليس لهم[3] "O people! It is I, a son of Prophet's daughter's. We are superior in your guardianship to the false claimants."

Elsewhere, أنا أحقّ من غير لقرابتي من رسول الله[4] "And I deserve it more than any one else for my kinship with Allāh's Messenger."

Furthermore, Imām's disciples had appreciated different opportunities by presenting such a belief either in verses of poem or prose. Said by Muslim Ibn Ziyād was that by Almighty Allāh on no accounts was it Mu'āwiya's right to be a caliph. He overcame the Prophet's successor by deception and usurped his caliphate.[5] 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Abd Allāh Yazanī, one of Imām's companions in Karbalā, had composed,

أنا بن عبدالله من آل يزن ديني على دين حسين وحسن[6]

"I am 'Abd Allāh's son from Yazan family. My religion is the same as those of Ḥusayn and Ḥasan." Addressing Imām Ḥusayn (a), Ḥadjdjādj Ibn Masrūq had composed,

ثم أباك ذا الندى عليّا ذاك الذي نعرفه الوصيّا[7]

"You father, 'Alī, is sportsmanlike. He is the one whom we consider as the Prophet's successor."

It was composed by Hilāl Ibn Nāfi' Badjalī,

أنا الغلام التممي البجلي ديني على دين حسين وعلي[8]

"This is from Banū Tamīm and Badjalī and I believe in the religion Ḥusayn and his father, 'Alī believe.

In some verses 'Uthmān Ibn 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib had composed,

اني أنا عثمان ذو المناخر شيخي علي ذو الفعال الطاهر

---

[1]. In "Tārikh tashayyu' dar Irān" we have discussed in detail.

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p. 170; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p. 135

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p. 137

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, pp. 144-145

[5]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 98

[6]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 194

[7]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 199

[8]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 201

و ابن عـــم النبي الطاهر أخو حسيـــن خيـــرة الاخانـــر
و سيد الكبار والاصاغر بعد الرسول والوصي الناصر[1]

"The possessor of honor is no one but me. My master, 'Alī, is the actor of all purely good deeds. The causin of the immaculate Prophet is me. I am the brother of Ḥusayn, the most chosen of the chosen and the master of the youngest and the eldest after the Prophet and his successor."

After Nafi' Ibn Hilāl had said, أنا الجملي أنا على دين علي "My religion is the religion of 'Alī."

A person from the rival army said, أنا على دين عثمان[2] "My religion is that of 'Uthmān."

What can be easily discerned from these verses and others quoted from 'Abbās Ibn 'Alī and others is the Shi'ites belief of Imām's followers not only in political arena but also in ideological one.

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.V. P. 206

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp. 331, 336

CHAPTER VIII
TRANSFER OF CALIPHATE TO THE MARWĀNIDS

DISPUTE BETWEEN ḤIDJĀZ AND DAMASCUS

Seemingly subsequent to Imām Ḥusayn's martyrdom, there existed no hurdle facing the Umayya. It was Yazīd's impudence that had one of the Muhādjirūn's descendant, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr, muster up courage and cause turbulence in Ḥidjāz. Although one of the instigators of the war of Djamal was he, during Imām Ḥusayn's several-month presence in Mecca, despite his own mind and due to his political harmony with Imām, he established a good rapport with him. (Stipulated by all historians, however, is that he wished Imām had gone to Kūfa and Ḥidjāz had been prepared for him. Every thing went on favorably). Imām Ḥusayn was martyred. There remained no competitor for 'Abd Allāh in Ḥidjāz. Nevertheless, not only he did by no means intend to battle against Yazīd overtly, but also had claimed that he wanted the caliphate not for himself and he proposed that the sequence and designation of the caliphs be in accordance with the "council".[1] He, however, began securing allegiance from the people of Ḥidjāz covertly.

Being extremely concerned about the probable aftermath of Karbalā movement, Yazīd exerted himself to invoke trickery like his father. Accordingly, he sent presents to Ibn Zubayr. In no way did he accept. As soon as he aggravated his conflict, a group from Mecca and Medina joined him.[2]

Once more Yazīd dispatched a number of the distinguished of Damascus to silence him through alluring and menacing. As well as indicting Yazīd for corruption, he announced that revolting was not his intention and he had chosen the shrine to be secure from Yazīd and others. He described himself as a pigeon among the pigeons of the shrine.[3]

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol IV. pp. 16, 17

[2]. Ibid. p.17

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p. 285; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, pp. 19, 20, 21

Yazīd was set to suppress Ibn Ziyād's movement as soon as possible. He commanded Medina governor, 'Amr Ibn Sa'īd Ibn 'Āṣ, as a result, to delegate a group to kill Ibn Zubayr in Mecca.[1] 'Amr Ibn Sa'īd also sent 'Amr Ibn Zubayr, who was 'Abd Allāh's brother and Umayya on his mother's side, to accompany the army going for a battle. A clash between he and his brother in the vicinity of Mecca ended to 'Amr's defeat and capture. All the excruciating tortures he sustained under the name of Islamic punishment limits for his atrocities caused him so enervated that he lost his life in 'Abd Allāh's prison with no doctor.[2]

This incident had prompted the followers of Zubayr to feel more powerful and absorb people in both Medina and Ṭā'if. Since Ibn Zubayr considered Walīd Ibn 'Uqba who had replaced 'Amr Ibn Sa'īd perilous in Medina, he urged Yazīd in a letter to substitute a sedate one for him if he wanted the state to improve. No sooner was 'Uthmān Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Abī Sufyān appointed[3] than their pressure exerted on the Umayyads being in Mecca and Ṭā'if multiplied.[4] There, two towns at a regular pace were seized by 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr. Now Damascus was assured that in order to pacify Ḥidjāz, its forces never suffice and it was obliged to seek help from the dwellers of Damascus.

THE BATTLE OF ḤARRA WĀQIM

Among the most detestable atrocities committed by the Umayya following Imām Ḥusayn's martyrdom was one notorious for the event of Ḥarra in Islamic history. This event is connected to the revolt of Medina in 26th or 27th Dhi l-Ḥadjdja, 63 A.H.[5], not 62[6] nor 64[7] A.H. which culminated in bloodletting by Damascus army. Three versions as alluded to by historians elucidating the motivations behind the revolt,

First: According to Balādhurī when 'Abd Allāh murdered his brother, 'Amr, he summoned people to balk at obeying Yazīd and to combat against him. Later than Medina which was called upon. Ḥidjāz bowed to be dutiful to him. 'Abd Allāh Ibn Muṭī' secured allegiance from Medina on behalf of

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p. 23

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, pp. 285, 286; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV. P.28

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.30

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p. 277

[5]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p. 220; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp. 374, 380; Ashrāf, vol.IV, p.41

[6]. Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 251; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p. 42

[7]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 374 mentioned as untrue.

Ibn Zubayr. Upon hearing the news, Yazīd appealed to the governor for dispatching the distinguished of Medina to him for affability....[1] As indicated through this version, Medina stood against Yazīd as a result of swearing allegiance to Ibn Zubayr, due to the fact that subsequent to the event of Ḥarra, Ibn Zubayr had proclaimed to his adherents, "Your friends were all massacred in the event".[2] Abu l-Faradj has also presented interpretation concerning how Medina deposed Yazīd from caliphate and swore allegiance to Ibn Zubayr in the process of its revolt.[3]

Second: Written by Ya'qūbī is that once 'Uthmān Ibn Muḥammad was appointed as the governor of Medina, in order Ibn Mīnā as usual to take Ṣawāfī -the picked-out objects from Bayt al-Māl exclusively for the caliph- he went to Medina. Deeming them their own properties, a number of people inhibited him from taking. The insurrection and dismissal of the Umayya from the town stemmed from the verbal dispute occurred between people and the governor.[4] Like this narration Ibn Qutayba has also narrated.[5]

Third: Ṭabarī's version is that after 'Uthmān Ibn Muḥammad's appointment, he sent a group from among the distinguished of Medina to Yazīd to be endowed with his affability and generosity. While returning from Damascus, they commenced slandering Yazīd, ليس له دين، يشرب الخمر، يغرف بالطنابير ويضرب عنده القيان ويلعب بالكلاب "Being irreligious, he drinks, he plays lute, plays with the dogs and his slaves play music for him."

In lieu of admiring him, they, consequently, declared that they would neither comply with him nor approve his sovereignty.[6]

It seems that all the three points were taken into account. Immediately after proposing the first matter, Balādhurī propounded the third one. Zubayr-orientedness has certainly been considered as a fundamental element in Ḥidjāz. The second matter was then what could pave the ground for nation's disgust from the Umayya.

In historical sources Ḥidjāz is famed for being Abū Bakr- and 'Umar-oriented whereas Damascus famed for being Umayyads-oriented and such places as Iraq for Shi'ism and alike. Such a feature attributed to the people of Ḥidjāz particularly people of Medina who had been accomplices in 'Uthmān's assassination, impeded them to be approved by the Umayya and vice versa. Moreover, Medina which had observed 'Umar's open-

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p. 31

[2]. Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.III, p.156

[3]. al-Aghānī, vol.I, pp. 21-24

[4]. Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 250

[5]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.206

[6]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 368; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.31

handedness including both Muhādjirūn and Anṣār, now could in no way tolerate the Umayya when noticing how Mu'āwiya and his son treated for taking the properties.

Ibn Zubayr's emergence in political scene as well as the Umayya's fragility in Ḥidjāz laid the foundations for the riot of Medina. Yazīd's attempt for pacifying them through 'Abd Allāh Ibn Dja'far remained abortive.[1] Nu'mān Ibn Bashīr, a pro-Umayyads Anṣār, (converting to a pro-Zubayr one and killed later) went to Medina to summon the people to "obedience to Imām" and "observing community" on behalf of Yazīd,[2] people declined, nevertheless. Ṭabarī has quoted 'Amr Ibn Sa'īd as saying, "Both Mecca and Medina incline towards Ibn Zubayr."[3] The insurgents besieged the Umayya together with their followers and governors being as many as one thousand assembled in Marwān Ibn Ḥakam's house and then expelled them disdainfully while children were hurling stones.[4] They bet that if the expelled swore not to return along with the Damascus army, they would be allowed to leave the city. They assented although atrocious individuals like Marwān[5] breached their promise. As this expulsion is introduced by Wāqidī to be done by Ibn Zubayr, he has added that the total number of those expelled from Mecca, Medina and other areas had been some four thousand people.[6] In accordance with Ibn A'tham the insurgents were led by 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥanẓala Ghasīl al-Malā'ika at Ibn Zubayr's behest, the governor of Medina.[7]

Wearied of his political strategies for silencing Ibn Zubayr as well as Medina, Yazīd sent an army to Medina. The commander of the army was Muslim Ibn 'Uqba who slaughtered so many people that he was named "Musraf" (prodigal killer). Apparently, his five-thousand-soldier[8] army was sufficient for suppressing Mecca and Medina through the number might have been higher. The people of Damascus were allowed to loot the town and take the possession of other's properties after gaining victory.[9] When

---

1. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, pp. 206, 207
2. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 367
3. Ibid. vol.IV, p. 369; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p. 32
4. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p. 208
5. Ibid. vol.I, p. 210
6. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, pp. 37, 38
7. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, pp. 292-293
8. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.250
9. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p.209; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.III, p. 372

being dispatched, they received their proportion from Bayt al-Māl thoroughly in addition to surplus a hundred Dīnārs.[1]

The residents of Medina dug trenches at the entrance to the town (exactly where the Prophet had dug on the course connecting the western Ḥarra to the eastern in Northern Medina) for the purpose of protecting the town. They were led 'Abd Allāh Ibn Muṭī', Ma'qal Ibn Sanān together with 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥanẓala at the top who was killed with his son during the clash.

Instantly after the Damascus armies arrived in Medina, they settled in the district of Ḥarra in consultation with 'Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwān expelled along with other members of the Umayya. They could also flourish to take in a number of Banū Ḥāritha with the help of Marwān by financial promises[2] and penetrate into the town. Their invasion and clashes lasted less than twenty four hours, they could besiege the town, however.[3] As already pledged by Yazīd entire possessions of the town belonged to the armies for a three-day period, hence they spared no crime in this respect. At this juncture, not only many were slayed but also a large number of women were raped.[4] Muslim Ibn 'Uqba murdered a multitude of the captives including a few from Quraysh.[5] Among the victims were a group from the Prophet's companions who were beheaded later.[6]

Reported by Ibn Qutayba the death toll included one thousand and seven hundred Anṣār, Muhādjir and their offspring plus ten thousand ordinary people.[7] He has added that as many as eighty people form companions were also killed.[8] Haytham Ibn 'Adī has recorded six thousand and five hundred casualties.[9] Reported by Mas'ūdī is ninety and so from Quraysh, the mentioned number from Anṣār and four thousand others identified.[10] What has been narrated by Ibn A'tham is that Muhādjirūn's offspring had been one thousand and three hundred while those of Anṣār had been one thousand

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.23; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 371

[2]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p. 211

[3]. Some had already predicted the inefficiency of the people of Medina (Al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p. 210) and some others and amazed at their submission (Al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, pp. 216, 217).

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.37; Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 250; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p. 295

[5]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.378

[6]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p. 213

[7]. Ibid. vol.I, p. 215

[8]. Ibid. vol.I, pp. 216, 220

[9]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p. 42

[10]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p. 70

and seven hundred.[1] This figure is except the common victims. These pieces of data depict how many citizens were decimated and how many houses were looted in the course of the incident. 'Awāna Ibn Ḥakam has stated that when they invaded the town from the side of Banū Ḥāritha, the only house which remained immune was Usāma Ibn Zayd's and the only woman was one from Ḥimyar. They combated the people of Medina while calling them Jews.[2] Within the event of Ḥarra it was not simply Anṣār who were borne a grudge by the Umayya but there also existed many a family from Muhādjirūn among the victims. Here we should make allowance for two points,

1. It can be claimed politically that although the scene was set for the invasion in early 60s, amongst the most crucial points meriting consideration is the participation of Medina in 'Uthmān's assassination in 36 AH. Having counted hopefully on 'Uthmān and specifically considering Medina as a principal accomplice of the assassination, the Umayya called the event of Ḥarra as a retaliatory reaction. It was the notion of Yazīd.[3] Another evidence is that this man namely, Muslim Ibn 'Uqba was captured in the Holy Prophet's term in Ghaṭafān. A woman from Anṣār purchased and then liberated him. When he was appealed in the course of the event for having regard to them for the sake of his past, he responded, لكنكم قتلتم عثمان[4] "You are 'Uthmān's assassins."

As soon as the news of the event spread, Yazīd recited the poem Ibn Zib'arā had composed in Uḥud i.e, ليت أشياخي ببدر شهدوا[5] "I wish my forefathers had been present in Badr observing."

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p. 295

[2].Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.37. As it can be perceived, Muslim Ibn 'Uqba's atrocities have been to the extent that Ṭabarī, Ibn Qutayba, Balādhurī, etc. have explicitly enumerated them. But can it be justified why Wellhausen defended him and starved to acquit him, (Tārikh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, p.156). Afterwards, he tried to introduce the discord between Damascus and Medina as purely political; nonetheless, it is clear that such an outlook was solely for exonerating both Damascus and the Umayya. We do never intend to totally define the people of Medina but it ought to be borne in mind that religious motivations could have by no means be ineffective, (Ibid. p.161). Under other circumstances, also his defen of Damascus is noticeable, (p.162). Supporting Ḥadjdjādj as well as denying the charges laid on him are among the cases (pp. 247, 248). He had also described sensual Sulaymān as a pious man (p.256).

[3]. Abu l-Faradj al-Aghānī, vol.I, p.14

[4]. Abu l-Faradj, al-Aghānī, vol.I, p.14

[5]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p. 267; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.42

Alluding to taking revenge of Anṣār for slaying Quraysh in Badr. While the Damascus army was invading Medina, it yelled out, يا لثارات عثمان[1] "O revengers for 'Uthmān's blood."

Subsequent to the event of Ḥarra, Muslim announced, "Now I am extremely thrilled to kill 'Uthmān's assassins".[2]

Later on 'Abd al-Malik addressed Medina as saying, انكم لا تحبونا وأنتم تذكرون يوم الحرة ونحن لانحبكم أبداً ونحن نذكر مقتل عثمان[3] "You do dislike us due to the event of Ḥarra and we do so due to 'Uthmān's murder."

2. Another matter was the staunch belief in "obedience to the caliph" and "observing community" prevailing among the people in Damascus and it was the Umayya who had made them firmly cleave to these principles. Such a belief was the main means for provoking and deploying them to Medina.[4] Deep-rootedly faithful to the principles, Muslim Ibn 'Uqba consented to attacking Medina and trespassing its sacred limits. After the massacre he said, "O my God, Thou art all aware that under no conditions have I disobeyed a caliph neither publicly nor privately. I consider the annihilation of the residents of Ḥarra my worthiest deed after the avowal of, لااله الا الله "There is no God but Allāh."[5]

"Nothing has so far been more adorable for me than turning cleansed. Now after wiping off these corrupt people I feel entirely cleansed", added he.[6]

Ḥusayn Ibn Numayr, Muslim's successor, quoted him while breathing his last enroute to Mecca subsequent to the event as saying, أللّهم انك تعلم أني لم أشاق خليفة ولم أفارق جماعة قط فاغفرلي[7] "O Allāh! You are well conscious that I have never ever stood against a caliph nor have I dared to secede from Community, so forgive me."

The impacts of such religious deviations were discussed in the chapter concerning Karbalā uprising. The principles of observing Community and obedience to Imām yet admissible, the main condition of obeying an Imām is venerating the religious limits and stipulations on his part.

---

[1]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p. 208

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p. 41

[3]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 122

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp. 373, 375

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p. 40; Ibn A'tham, vol.V, p. 301

[6]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.41

[7]. Ibid. vol.IV, p. 42; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.382; previously, we discussed it entitled "Religious Deviation in Karbalā".

The Damascus army after accomplishing their operations in Medina set out to Mecca to repeat the same crimes against Ibn Zubayr and his followers. Muslim passed away on the way and then Ḥusayn Ibn Numayr replaced him at Yazīd's behest. He proceeded and for a several-month period settled on the outskirts of Mecca and threw stones and balls of fire to the divine shrine from the pinnacles of the mountains through catapults.[1] Becoming informed of Yazīd's death in Rabi' al-Awwal 64 A.H., he ultimately called a truce. Ḥusayn, who had entered Mecca for the pupose of pilgrimage following a concord, proposed Ibn Zubayr to accompany him to Damascus and lay the groundwork for his caliphate. He declined, however.[2] In order to take part in the activities prevalent in Damascus regarding the caliphate, he returned. The way was wholly paved for Ibn Zubayr in Iraq since 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād had rushed to Damascus upon hearing Yazīd's demise.

At this stage, there was no obstacle facing Ibn Zubayr in Ḥidjāz. The vital troubles were in Iraq in view of the fact that his plans for domination were thwarted by the Shi'ite Muslims who were extricated from the Umayya's domination and had gained a profound influence on the city.

THE PENITENTS' MOVEMENT IN 65 A.H

Tawwābīn's Movement occurred in 65 against the Umayya's sovereignty and for the purpose of eradicating Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī's assassins although the start of which had sparkled emotionally with in the hearts of a huge number of the Shi'ite Muslims after the even of Karbalā. The Kūfiyān Shi'ite Muslims, who had become conscience- stricken at leaving Imām Ḥusayn helpless in Karbalā, were determined to make amends at all costs. Not supporting Imām Ḥusayn had become an unforgivable sin in their sight the compensation thereof would be feasible provided that they be killed or kill his assassins.

The Umayya and their agents had Kūfa under their thumbs for a while following the event in Karbalā. Despite the suppression of the Shi'ite Muslims and the existing restlessness created by Ibn Zubayr in the easternmost part of the Islamic land, the Shi'ite Muslims were still deemed perilous. Here recounting an example of the Shi'ite Muslims' valour against 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād looks appropriate.

Some day after the event of Karbalā 'Ubayd Allāh on the pulpit in a mosque proclaimed. "Exaltation does solely belong to Allāh who made the

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p. 301; Akhbār-al-ṭiwāl, p.268

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, p. 306

truth prevail and aided Amīr al-Mu'minīn Yazīd Ibn Mu'āwiya and his party".

As soon as he heard, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Afīf Azdī who had lost the use of one of his eyes in Djamal and the other in Ṣiffīn stood up and dissented, "O liar! O liar's son! By Almighty Allāh you, your father with the one designating you and his father murder the Prophet's descendants, and now talk like the truthful!"

"O Allāh's foe! What are you saying about 'Uthmān?" 'Ubayd Allāh asked.

"He was a man who did both good and bad, both reformed and corrupted. It is Allāh's Providence to treat justly. Why do you not inquire about yourself, your father, Yazīd and his father?" 'Abd Allāh retorted.

'Ubayd Allāh said furiously, "Never shall I inquire so that I can take your life. I have constantly beseeched Him to bestow martyrdom on me. Before you were born I lost the use of my eye hence I relinquished my hope." "But now I offer my gratitude to Him who is accepting my prayer," calmly uttered 'Abd Allāh.[1]

When the turmoil caused by Ibn Zubayr flared up in Mecca and the appearance of a revolt in Kūfa was probable, Ibn Ziyād summoned 'Amr Ibn Ḥurayth, Kūfa's governor, to delineate to what extent the news is reliable.

He stated, "Ibn Zubayr is never threatening for Amīr al-Mu'minīn Yazīd." إني أخاف عليه من الترابية شيعة أبي تراب علي بن ابي طالب (ع) "What perturbs me is 'Alī's Shi'ite Muslims. Is there anyone in Kūfa nowadays ho feels affection for him?"

"Definitely no one adores him but abhores him," answered 'Amr Ibn Ḥurayth.

Ibn Ziyād named Mukhtār as an instance. Later, Ibn Ḥurayth apprehended Mukhtār[2] until 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar went to his assistance.

Next adventures proved that 'Alī's and his descendant's faithful followers were myriad in Kūfa who were secretly in contact with one another those days. The dilemma facing the Shi'ite Muslims was double-sided. One was from the Umayya's side and the other from the side of the nobles and a large number of Kūfiyāns who had been in the opposite front against Imām Ḥusayn in Karbalā; There fore, the stance taken was anti-Shi'ism. A group of the Shi'ite Muslims set to take a revenge for Imām Ḥusayn's martyrdom were necessarily hostile to Kūfiyāns as well who had martyred Imām.[3]

---

[1]. al-Muḥabbar, pp.480-481

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, pp.268, 269

[3]. Ibid. vol.VI, p.47

Succeeding Yazīd's death in 64, Shi'ite Muslims were called upon by Sulaymān Ibn Ṣurad Khuzā'ī. Many replied him in affirmative.[1] But since the Umayya's sovereignty had not become unstable yet, there was no strong probability for their emergence. First of all they began dissemination and assembling the propagandists, they trained and spread them around.[2] Little by little, the Umayya's state deteriorated. The second Mu'āwiya, Yazīd's son, either abdicated or was curbed by others. The status quo in Damascus was the scene of unrest. The clashes were arisen among 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr's adherents on the one hand and among Marwān Ibn Ḥakam's on the other hand. The consequence of such riots was nothing except the stabilization of The Umayya's sovereignty in Iraq and the abolition of which gradually notwithstanding, 'Abd al-Malik could take Iraq under the Umayya's rule once again in early 70 A.H.

The Shi'ite Muslims appreciated the convenient opportunity and maintaining their endeavors commenced from 61 onwards to instruct forces and store weapons[3] they began recruiting troops. Four eminent Shi'ite Muslims who were chosen as responsible for organizing with Sulaymān were Musayyib Ibn Nadjba, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sa'd Ibn Nawfal, Rufā'a Ibn Shaddād as well as 'Abd Allāh Ibn Wāl. A great number of the renowned Shi'ite Muslims in Kūfa took part in the session convened.[4]

Delivering lectures in this convention, the Shi'ites leaders laid stress upon making amends for their oppressive behavior towards the right of the prophet's infallible household and leaving him all alone. They were intent on repenting and being killed to make up for their misdeed.[5] By relying on the Qur'ānic verse of,

يا قوم إنكُم ظَلمتمْ أنفُسَكمْ باتّخاذِكُمْ العِجْل فَتُوبُوا إلي بارِئكُمْ فَاقْتُلوا أنفسكُمْ [6]

"O my people! Thou have surely been unjust to thyselves by taking the calf (for a god), therefore turn to thy Creator (penitently), so kill thy people."

---

[1]. Tadjārib al-umam, vol.II, pp.97, 98

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.432; see also Tadjārib al-umam, vol.II, p.97

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.432; See also Tadjārib al-umam, vol.II, p.97

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.428

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.206; Tadjārib al-umam, vol.II, p.96; al-Futūḥ, vol.VI, p.50

[6]. Baghara, 54

In the meeting all reached an agreement to cooperate. Those who appealed for fiscal help to the movement were supposed to refer to 'Abd Allāh Ibn Wāl.[1]

The elderly man elected as the leader of the movement was Sulaymān, from among Prophet's companions and Imām 'Alī's adherents. In his first action, he wrote to Sa'd Ibn Ḥudhayfa Ibn al-Yamān who was one of the special Shi'ite Muslims residing in Ctesiphon, a Shi'ites Muslim-populated area, to join them together with other Shi'ite Muslims if willing. He declared the predetermined date and place of departure. It was Rabi' al-Awwal, 1st. 65 in Nukhayla, well-known barracks in Kūfa.[2]

The words attributed to the penitents (Tawwābīn) to have uttered in a sermon clearly manifest the content of the movement. Enumerating the greatness of the Prophet's descendants, 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn 'Abd Allāh hinted at how they were affronted in Karbalā and while addressing the audience being Tawwābīn, he affirmed how to repent, أما أدعوكم إلى كتاب الله وسنة نبيّه والطلب بدماء أهل بيته وإلى جهاد المحلين والمارقين فإن قتلنا فما عند الله خير للأبرار وإن ظهرنا، رددنا هذا الأمر إلى أهل بيت نبيّنا[3] "I do call you towards the divine Book, the Prophet's Sunna, a revenge for Ahl al-Bayt's blood and Djihād against the deniers of the religion as well as Māriqīn. Were we killed, whatsoever exclusively assigned to the benevolent would be the best. But if we could succeed, the authority would be belonged to Ahl al-Bayt."

Concurrent with launching the movement of Tawwābīn, both Kūfa and Baṣra were ruled by 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr's agents. As no one had replaced 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād in Iraq who had already fled to Damascus, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr, the ruler of Mecca from 61 on, dispatched his agents to Iraq and accordingly the pro-Zubayr elements took the thorough power of oriental Islamic land. A man called 'Abd Allāh Yazīd Anṣārī was appointed as governor and Ibrāhīm Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Ṭalḥa as treasurer.

Kūfiyān noblemen who were every time in favor of the Umayya inwardly and outwardly, straightly invoked 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr on learning that a Shi'ites movement was expected. On the other hand, Shi'ite Muslims and those having a tendency went towards Sulaymān or Mukhtār as it will be noticed later.

Vital for the Shi'ite Muslims was a reaction against both the nobles and the ruling system in Kūfa. They were by no means two separate issues

---

[1]. Tadjārib al-umam, vol.II, p.96

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV. pp.430, 431; See also Ansāb al-ashrāf. vol.V, p.206; Tadjārib al-umam, vol.II, p.97; al-Futūḥ, vol.VI, p.52, a similar letter was also written to Baṣrian Shi'ite Muslims led by Muthannā Ibn Makhraba.

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.433

inasmuch as the governor of the town was a Zubayr-designated one and the nobles were also for the governorship. Hardly ever could Shi'ite Muslims clash them.

'Abd Allāh Ibn Yazīd, the governor, adopted initially a misleading stance to turn Shi'ite Muslims' attention to Damascus and goad them into confronting 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād's army departing from Damascus. He believed that they would be naturally supported if they searched for Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī's assassins. Since it was not vague that his assassin was no one but Ibn Ziyād, never would Tawwābīn trigger off a wave of carnage inside the town[1]. This taken stance not merely could contribute to the intratown security to be well safeguarded but could propel Zubayr's opponents to come into conflict with one another. And consequently pro-Zubayr men would simply get rid of their threats. Although the position was propounded a reconcilable one by such persons as Ibrāhīm Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Ṭalḥa, and even if 'Abd Allāh Ibn Yazīd's real intention were not deceitful, it compelled Tawwābīn to leave Kūfa and encounter the major army of Damascus with their minor one.

At all events it forced the Shi'ite Muslims to act openly and get fully equipped to proceed to Damascus.[2]

Sulaymān who was also gratified with military expedition to Damascus in a response to those advising that Imām's assassins live in Kūfa said that the foremost cause of the event was Ibn Ziyād.[3] By the same token no one defied. Sulaymān had added that a battle inside Kūfa would culminate in fratricide and automatically multiply the adversaries and figures like 'Umar Ibn Sa'd were not as powerful as Ibn Ziyād.[4] Sulaymān might have implied that he would meet his doom later.

In the throes of the activities, Mukhtār, a prominent Shi'ites Muslim, arrived in Kūfa. As elicited from the reports, he had preplanned to mobilize the Shi'ite Muslims for an uprising but he was faced with Tawwābīn's movement in Kūfa. As far as he was concerned such a movement was on no accounts a fundamental stride for achieving the goal and the only aftermath thereof would be Shi'ites's genocide. The propaganda made a number of

---

[1]. See Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol. IV, p. 438; Tadjārib al-umam, vol.II, p. 99; vol.IV, p. 207

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p. 208; Tadjārib al-umam, vol. II, p. 99

[3]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol. IV, pp. 353-354

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol. VI, pp. 65-66

Shi'ite Muslims to incline towards him.[1] Approximately a quarter of those swearing allegiance to Sulaymān began advocating Mukhtār.[2]

Some four thousand people out of sixteen or twelve thousand men who had sworn allegiance to Sulaymān prepared themselves for setting out to Damascus and with Sulaymān's persuasion one thousand more joined them.[3] After Sulaymān and the rest of Tawwābīn left Kūfa, Ḥusayn's assassins (such as Shabath Ibn Rib'ī and others) breathed a sigh of relief. The only serious misgiving they had was about the presence of Mukhtār. In a collusion they pressurized the governor of Kūfa to incarcerate him.[4] It was after the event of Tawwābīn that once more he was set free while mediated by his sister's husband, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar.

The atmosphere predominant on penintents's army was purely mingled with determination of repentance. فتنادي الناس من كل جانب: انا لا نطلب الدنيا وليس لها خرجنا[5] "The voice heard from the four corners of the army was, neither do we seek for this worldly life, nor do we revolt for its sake."

At this time, Marwān who had overcome Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Qays in Damascus dispatched troops to Iraq. Quite evident that Tawwābīn could in no way resist against them. Changing his former position, the governor of Kūfa sent a message to Sulaymān to wait for his army to battle together against 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād.[6] His later position was on account of the critical menace Damascus had for Ḥidjāz and with Tawwābīn's defeat, the invasion to Iraq was incontrovertible. It was not admitted by Sulaymān. After leaving Kūfa in the middle of the way they received a letter from the governor repeating the same proposal. Sulaymān declined again. He had said that if acquiescing to collaboration, troops would disperse. According to him it would additionally result in Zubayr's sovereignty and subsequent to the victory, they would be obliged to battle for 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr and it was a deviation in a real sense of word. Not once did defeat obsess Sulaymān and his followers. They would embrace martyrdom. They had pledged if they won they would transfer the rule to those entitled.[7] With this way of reasoning, allying with Ibn Zubayr was not rational at all.

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol. IV, p. 499. See also Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p. 207; Tadjārib al-Uman, vol. II, p.98

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. V, p.208

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, pp. 452-453; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. V, p. 208

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol. IV, p. 450

[5]. Ibid. vol. IV, p. 453

[6]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, Vol.III, p.455

[7]. Ibid. Vol.III, p.459; See Tadjārib al-umam, Vol.II, p.103

Tawwābīn first set out to Kūfa but en route a number of fellow-travellers seceded from the group.[1] They paid tribute to Imām Ḥusayn's tomb and while sedding tears they entreated Allāh to forgive them. Later, they farewelled the martyred Imām one by one[2] and went to Djaṣāṣa and then to Anbār and the district of of Ṣudūr. Since their destination was Damascus, they went to Hīt and then to Qirqīsiyā''. It was where Zufar Ibn Ḥārith, among Marwān's opponents succeeding the internal disputes in Damascus, welcomed Tawwābīn with open arms. Equipping them, he provided them with adequate information about the combat Zone. Then they moved to Damascus. Re-highlighting repentence, Sulaymān Ibn Ṣurad made speeches once more and reiterated that their behavior towards the wounded and captives in Damascus should be like that of Imām 'Alī (a).

While it was not too distant to the enemy's position, Musayyib Ibn Nudjba along with a few Tawwābīns as the vanguards launched an ambush which put the opposite vanguard to flight and supplied them with loot. Afterwards, the two armies were pit against each other. The Umayya rival recommended that they bow to 'Abd al-Malik, Marwān's son, at the present time that he was dead. In return, Tawwābīn's recommendation as Shi'ite Muslims was that they hand over 'Abd al-Malik due to the slaughter he had made. And later they could both take an action against 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr, oust him and then, نُرد الأمر ألي أهل بيت نبيّنا الذين أتانا الله من قبلهم بالنعمَة والكرامة[3] "They leave the authority in the custody of prophet's Household, the ones through whom Allāh bestows His mercy and blessings."

Naturally neither of them acceded to, however.

The clashes were triggered off. First day was a mischance for the foe, but since fresh troops were regularly being dispatched next days, the pressure exerted on Tawwābīn was gradually being intensified. On the second day eight thousand soldiers commanded by Shurahbīl Ibn Dhi l-Kilā' joined Ḥusayn Ibn Numayr's twelve- thousand-soldier army.[4] The third day battle led to Sulaymān's and then Musayyib's martyrdom. After a short time 'Abd Allāh Ibn Wāl who was supposed to command succeeding them achieved martyrdom as well. Later on describing whom he had killed, his murderer stated that he was said to be one of the Iraqi religious jurisprudents

---

[1]. Some one thousand went back; See Ansāb al-ashrāf, Vol.V, p.209, as narrated by Ibn A'tham, they were 3300 when encountering, Vol.VI, p.8

[2]. al-Futūḥ, Vol.VI, p.89

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, p.464; Ansāb al-ashrāf, Vol.V, p.210; Tadjārib al-umam, Vol.II, p.109 and Ibn A'tham has said, هلم الي طاعة اهـل بيـت النبـوة "Hasten to obey the Prophet's Household" Al-Futūḥ, Vol.VI, p.82

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, p.460

who, كانوا يكثرون الصوم والصلاة ويفتون الناس "performed so many prayers, observed so many fasts and issued Islamic verdicts among people."

The other commander of Tawwābīn, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sa'd, was also martyred. Only when it was Rufā'a Ibn Shaddād's turn, did he retreat overnight to Iraq.

Though the Shi'ite Muslims of Ctesiphon and Baṣra were assumed to join them, they could not reach in time. While nearly a hundred and seventy Shi'ite Muslims from Ctesiphon and three hundred from Baṣra led by Makhraba Ibn Muthannā had been moving towards Tawwābīn, they encountered the few-survived of them withdrawing and then returned with them.[1] Corresponding to what Balādhurī has reported, the Shi'ite Muslims of Baṣra had joined Tawwābīn nearby Imām Ḥusayn's tomb[2] It appears not to be true. As a consequence, their movement bore no tangibly fruitful results.

Here Some Points Merit Attention as Regards to the penitents

A. In the light of the foregoing proofs, Tawwābīn's religious ideology can be easily measured. Their beliefs were based on a ideological Shi'ism the most central pillar of which was belief in Imamate. Devolving the leadership of the community upon Ahl al-Bayt was what had been time after time flashing among their remarks. Conforming to Imām 'Alī's lifestyle additionally confirms such ideology-based Shi'ism.

B. Another point was the psychological manner Tawwābīn had found. They were amongst the ones who did not participate in Karbalā event for whatever reason but when they came to their senses it was too late, for the Prophet's descendant had been tragically martyred and his captive family had been forced to traverse in Kūfa. The Kūfiyāns were severely reproached by Zaynab. Umm Kulthūm and Imām Sadjdjād(a). The outcome of the event as well as Ahl al-Bayt's such reactions generated feeling of sin for the Kūfiyāns and then it was their guilty conscience which distressed them the most and it was in view of the fact that they were those who had invited Imām to Kūfa.

The one and the only dose being able to soothe their agony was obliterating the psychological side-effects of sin. One of the ways for cleansing themselves was wiping off Imām's assassins; however, it was never as sweet as martyrdom. They felt that in order to tranquilize themselves even with killing his assassins, their misstep of default could not

---

[1]. Tadjārib al-umam, vol.II, pp.111, 112; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.470

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. V, p. 211

be compensated. Totally conscious of the greatest number of the army leaving Damascus accompanied by Ibn Ziyād, scarcely ever did they hesitate about the struggle. Tawwābīn's assessment of the current status quoin Kūfa was by no means politically precise. Less determining was planning on conquering Kūfa, murdering Ḥusayn's murderers and equipping Iraq against Damascus in their opinion. These are all what were pursued by Mukhtār later.

The only precious thing was repentance for them. A kind of repentance which could solely be accomplished through nothing but martyrdom. At the last moments of war when Rufā'a said, اني لا أريد، أريد لقاء ربي واللحاق باخواني والخروج من الدنيا الى الاخرة "What we yearn for is not what you seek. Meeting our Lord, reunifying our brethren and farewelling this world are our wishes."

In an attack, he was murdered later. 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Azīz Kindī who had left his child in the custody of those from Kind in Damascus launched an attack from the other side and then achieved martyrdom.[1] Kurayb Ibn Zayd Ḥimyarī together with a hundred people heedless of Rufā'a's order did not retreat.

He had said, "I have learned that a group is set to return, but لا أولي هذا العدّو ظهري حتى أرد موارد اخواني "I neverever turn my back to the foe so that I can reunify my brothers."

Dhi l-Kilā', a Damascus commander, gave him guarantee of clemency since they were both from Ḥimyar originally.

Nevertheless Kurayb responded, انا قد كنّا آمنين من الدنيا، انّما خرجنا نطلب أمان الاخرة "We have been in peace and quiet in this world, we have come for we search for a peacefuand quiet life in the world hereafter."[2]

The utterances and verses of poems narrated from Tawwābīn in the course of attacks against Damascus army entirely denote the concept of repentance and the manifestation thereof in departing this world and attaining martyrdom. From the incipient stage of the battle, Sulaymān Ibn Ṣurad yelled out, يا شيعة آل محمد! فوالله ما بينكم وبين الشهادة ودخول الجّنة والراحة من هذا الدنيا الا فراق الانفس والتوبة والوفاء بالعهد "O Shi'ite Muslims of Muḥammad's family! Not a short distance is there between you and martyrdom, your entrance to the Heaven and being released from this worldly life except sublimating your souls, repenting and fulfilling your pledge."

In a poem he had said,

اليك ربي تبت عن ذنوبي	وقد علاني في الوري شيبي
فارحم عبيداً غير ما تكذيب	واغفرذنوبي سيدي وحوبي

---

[1]. Ibid. vol. IV, p.469

[2]. Ibid. vol. IV, p.469

"O My Lord, I beg for forgiveness for my sins whereas where as my old age has made me conspicuous. While not denying me, pardon your servant and have mercy on him, the sinner."

'Abd Allāh Ibn Sa'd has composed,

ارحم الـــهي عبدك التوابا ولا تواخـــذه فقـــد أنابـــا

لا كوفة يبقي ولا عـــراقا لا بل يريـــد الموت والعتاقـــا[1]

"O my God! Have mercy on your penitent servant. Take not him to task for he has repented. No longer is he after Kūfa or Iraq. He is merely after death and freedom."

Rufā'a Ibn Shaddād also has composed,

يارب اني تائب اليكا قد اتكلت شديّ عليكا[2]

"My Lord! Not only have I repent but also I have trusted in you."

While Ṣakhr Ibn Ḥudhayfa was in battle with thirty of his cousins, he said,

الى الله من الذنب أفرّ أنوي ثواب الله فيما قد اسر[3]

"I run away from sins to Allāh my only intention is nothing but Allāh's reward."

MUKHTĀR'S UPRISING (66, 67 A.H.)

Mukhtār has been Abū 'Ubayd Thaqafī whose fame thanks to his valor in Muslim Arab's first attacks against the Iranians as Muslim's commander. He was martyred in the event of Djisr while at the helm.

The ever-first Mukhtār's bad record inscribed in Islamic history had been his non-Shi'ites behavior towards Imām Ḥasan (a). When Imām was wounded in Sābāṭ of Ctesiphon, he resided in the governor's house, Mukhtār's uncle, Mukhtār suggested that he be handed over to Mu'āwiya in order to prove his good will to Mu'āwiya. As soon as his uncle became incensed, Mukhtār became mute.[4]

It is said that for this reason Mukhtār had been deemed as 'Uthmānids (pro-'Uthmān) in Shi'ites Muslim's view[5] until he allied himself to the Shi'ite Muslims later. Since there were abundant motivations among the Umayya narrators to introduce Mukhtār a hypocrite, a liar and a man with

---

1. al-Futūḥ, vol.VI, p. 83
2. Ibid. vol.VI, P. 84
3. Ibid. vol.516, p. 85
4. Ibn Sa'd,'Asākir Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, p.154; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.441
5. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p.214

capricious personality, such a conduct ascribed to Mukhtār must be forged. Undeniable is the fact that prior to the event of Karbalā he was among the renowned Shi'ite Muslims of Kūfa and when Muslim Ibn 'Aqīl came Kūfa, he sojourned in his house.[1] As no definite time had been determined for the start of uprising, Mukhtār could not manage to assist Muslim when invading Ibn Ziyād's palace and after clashes was arrested and martyred. Out of Kūfa was Mukhtār[2] and when returned, he found that Ibn Ziyād had dominated, declared martial law and had put a great number under lock and key in the mosque.

Mukhtār who was unaware of the happenings was apprehended by 'Amr Ibn Ḥurayth. Regarding his old amicable relationship with 'Amr Ibn Ḥurayth, he did his utmost to persuade him to intercede for him with Ibn Ziyād and say that he had surrendered. Nonetheless, Mukhtār was imprisoned and throughout the event of Karbalā he was in jail but later 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar acted as an intermediary and released him. Ibn Ziyād offered him a three-day respite to leave Kūfa as soon as possible.[3] Normally Mukhtār's activities at odds with the Umayya accounted for Ibn Ziyād's extreme fright. According to narrated accounts, whipping at Ibn Ziyād's behest had led to loss of the use of Mukhtār's one eye.[4]

Travelling to Mecca, Mukhtār had to live in Ṭā'if for one year where his tribe, Banū Thaqīf, lived. After going back to Mecca, Mukhtār was asked by Ibn Zubayr, the present governor of Mecca, for cooperation. He bet to swear allegiance to him rovided that he took counsel from him in all affairs. At that time, Mecca was under siege by Damascus. Mukhtār also defended the Divine Shrine with the other Muslims side by side so that the rival army could no more resist and returned. Even a group of Khāridjites were among the participants.[5] Their actions were as a counter to profanity of Damascus army about Ka'ba.

After the siege was raised and the Zubayr-supported ones seized the control of Kūfa, Mukhtār went back to Kūfa. Ibn Zubayr who had suspected him, ignored him and never allowed him to take up a post. The majority of historians have reported that what had been frequently stressed by Mukhtār

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.440; Mab'ūth al-Ḥusayn, p.98; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, Vol.IV, p. 22; Ansāb al-ashrāf, Vol.V, p.215

[2]. Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥasan, p.154; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.441

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp.441-442. Ya'qūbī has written, وكان مختار أقبل في جماعة يريدون نصر حسين بن علي (ع) فاخذه عبيد الله بن زياد فحسبه "Since Mukhtār was the vanguard of those desiring to help Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī; 'Ubayd Allāh imprisoned him" Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.58

[4]. al-Muḥabbar, p.303

[5]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī,vol.IV, p.446

succeeding the event of Karbalā was taking revenge on Ḥusayn Ibn ʻAlī's assassins and his likely uprising.[1]

His arrival in Kūfa was concurrent with Tawwābīn's preparation for leaving the town. As far as Sulaymān's long record of service was concerned, Mukhtār could never absorb naturally as much Shiʻite Muslims as he could. However he discredited Sulaymān's action in a way that he explicitly had announced that, لا علم له بالحروب والسياسة[2] "By no mean is Sulaymān acquainted with war and politics."

Mukhtār's propagation retarded Tawwābīn's activity. The majority was with Sulaymān whereas only a minority had joined Mukhtār. No alternative existed for Mukhtār except awaiting patiently until Tawwābīn decide.[3] Upon Sulaymān's departure from the town, Imām Ḥusayn's assassins, fearful of Mukhtār, compelled the governor, pro-Zubayr, to put him in prison. This measure was adopted irrespective of all pressures the Shiʻite Muslims exerted on the governor to consider his past being with Mukhtār and liberate him. Later on, ʻAbd Allāh Ibn ʻUmar interceded for Mukhtār with Ibn Zubayr and after Shiʻite Muslims' undertaking Mukhtār was set free,[4] Mukhtār was in prison when the news of Tawwābīn's defeat and return to Kūfa spread through. In a message he offered his condolences to Rufāʻa Ibn Shaddād and in addition to wishing blessing for Sulaymān's soul and complementing his character, he urged the survived to prepare for an uprising. He invited them towards the divine Book, the Prophet's Sunna, revenge for Ahl al-Bayt's blood, defense of the oppressed and Djihād against Muḥillīn, those going beyond the sacred limits of Islam and converting Ḥarām (unlawful) into Ḥalāl (lawful).[5]

In 66, Kūfa governor was ousted by ʻAbd Allāh Ibn Zubayr and ʻAbd Allāh Ibn Muṭīʻ was appointed in place. Since the inception, the new governor announced that he would follow the policies of the second and the third caliphs in economic arena but Sāʼib Ibn Mālik Ashʻarī Stimulated by Mukhtār objected to him as insisting "Except ʻAlī's policy nothing ought to be followed".[6]

Mukhtār secretly had been keeping on his activities. Holding clandestine meetings, he gathered the Shiʻite Muslims together to absorb while introducing himself as Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya's representative.

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.IV, p.443

[2]. Ibid. vol.IV, pp.434 -449

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.VI, p.56

[4]. al-Futūḥ, Vol.V, p.74; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.488

[5]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp. 471, 478; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p. 212

[6]. al-Futūḥ, Vol.VI, p. 88; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, pp. 220-221

Although it had drawn the Shi'ite Muslims' attention to him, it had also evoked their doubt whether Mukhtār was truthful calling himself Muḥammad's representative! In order to make certain, they reached a decision to go to Medina and meet him. Leaving the town for Medina, 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Shurayḥ accompanying a group met Ibn Ḥanafiyya privately and asked him about his position concerning Mukhtār. Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya supported Mukhtār implicitly and ambiguously and said, أما ما ذكرتم من دعاء من دعاكم الي الطلب بدمائنا فوالله لوددت أنّ الله انتصر لنا من عدوّنا بمن شاء من خلقه[1] "About what you mentioned that someone has summoned you to rise up in revenge for Ahl al-Bayt's blood, by Almighty Allāh I desire that Allāh get our revenge by anyone of His servants He wills."

Nothing more did Ibn Ḥanafiyya add; therefore, they returned. Other Shi'ite Muslims came up to them questioning about his content or discontent. Ibn Shurayḥ replied that they asked his opinion and he, فأمرنا بمظاهرته[2] "commanded us to back him" and وأذن لنا في نصرتك[3] "allowed us to back him."

Such approval impelled those skeptical about banding together with Mukhtār by then to join him.

Mukhtār determined to consolidate his social bases via the advocacy of a number of chiefs of tribes endeavored to trace authoritative figures. Among them was Ibrāhīm Ibn Ashtar, Mālik Ashtar's son, who was esteemed both for his father's reputation in Shi'ism and his intrepidity and influence on the Nakha'ītes of Kūfa. Following the negotiations he had with Ibrāhīm, Mukhtār succeeded in attracting his attention and fortifying his position in Kūfa through him though Ibrāhīm detached himself from him later.

Wednesday night on Rabi' al-Awwal, 14th, 66, it was prearranged, was the promised day for triggering off the attack and rescuing the town from the yoke of Zubayr followers. 'Abd Allāh Ibn Muṭī' who had learned Mukhtār's possible insurrectoin had previously commanded to keep the town under tight security and impose a curfew. Keeping such news unrevealed was something beyond any possibility. From the very beginning he had been told that a large number of Turābiyya have sworn allegiance to Mukhtār.[4]

It could be two days to duedate when a group headed by Ibrāhīm encountered and then came into clashes with troops sent by Kūfa governor.

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 399; al-Futūḥ, vol.V, pp. 91, 92, 93

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p. 221

[3]. See al-Futūḥ, Vol.VI, p. 95; describing his father, he had said, وهو سيد الناس في محبة اهل البيت (ع) "His affection for the Household was the strongest among people"

[4]. al-Futūḥ, Vol.VI, p. 99. the Umayya and later pro-Zubayr people's intention of calling the Shi'ite Muslims "Turābiya" was usually disparaging them.

Decapitating Iyās Ibn Muḍārib, police chief, Ibrāhīm flourished to disperse them. They had to, it was evident, take the action prematurely. By chanting the slogans of, يا منصور أمت "O Manṣūr, kill the enemy!" (rehearsed by Muslims during the wars in Early Islamic Era) and يا لثارات حسين "O revengers for Ḥusayn's blood!" In line with which had ever been Mukhtār's movement, Shi'ite Muslims joined him. As narrated by Ibn A'tham, وجعل يخرج الناس من كل ناحية علي صعب وذلول[1] "Despite all complications, Muslims were joining him from everywhere."

Ibrāhīm's parties marched through the town to prompt the Shi'ite Muslims to join them. Mukhtār who considered commencing the war not allowable abiding by Imām 'Alī's conduct had forewarned Ibrāhīm not to be the beginner.[2] Conquering the town by Mukhtār's forces led to various clashes.[3] In the face of 'Abd Allāh Ibn Muṭī's' crowded army (some twenty thousand soldiers)[4], Mukhtār could assume control of Kūfa as a governor with his small army, a fifth as many as the rival's.

Throughout the battle the leaders in Mukhtār's army ceaselessly inspirited the Shi'ite Muslims to combat as mightily as possible. What Yazīd Ibn Anas or Mālik Ibn Sā'ib Ash'arī had been saying was, "O Shi'ite Muslims! Prior to this you were massacred, your limbs were cut up, you were blinded and hung from the branches of palms. All of these tortures were due to your affinity for the prophet's infallible household. They were occurring while you had stayed at homes and complied with your foes. What do you say now? If they overpower you, in the twinkling of an eye no one of you will remain alive at least."[5]

With Rashīd Ibn Iyās Ibn Muḍārib's murder and the dispersion of the troops commanded by Shabath Ibn Rib'ī, the palace was eventually besieged by Mukhtār's adherents. 'Abd Allāh Ibn Muṭī' after spending three days left the palace in secret and others also raised the white flag seeking a guarantee of clemency.

The noblemen, the most influential class in Kūfa, had compromised with the Umayya prior to Zubayr-appointed person's coming but later afraid of Shi'ite Muslims as well as their rule, joined forces with Ibn Zubayr's followers.[6] Such a class was also followed by many in its turn. Unlike Tawwābīn, whose troops were wholly Arabs, Mukhtār's were often Iranian

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, Vol.VI, p.105

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, p.498

[3]. al-Futūḥ, Vol.VI, p.103

[4]. al-Futūḥ, Vol.VI, p.106; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, Vol.VI, pp.108, 109

[5]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, p.503; al-Futūḥ, Vol.VI, pp.108,109

[6]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, p.507

and non-Iranian masters. A throng of Arabs later joined him, furthermore. The aforesaid masters were those who on the one hand had memorably and pleasantly experienced Imām 'Alī's Islamic and human conduct and on the other hand had endured the Umayya and the affiliated noblemen's pressure from 40A.H. It was why they were after a golden opportunity to modify their unbearable situation in the society and extricate themselves from the abjectness. Mukhtār's emergence was reciprocally beneficial to both the masters to attain influence through him and Mukhtār to remove the enemy through their aid.

In the morning of the day thereon the battle was due to start, Shabath Ibn Rib'ī recited the short Sūra (Qur'ānic chapters).

Being objected, he responded, "You see how Daylamites are standing before you and now you expect me to recite "the cow" and "'Imrān's family" Sūra (the longest of all)".[1]

When all were fleeing, Shabath addressed them as saying, أأنتم من عبيدكم تفرون[2] "Are you escaping from your own slaves?" "So acutely did the noble detested the masters that they murdered anyone captured but set the Arab ones free."[3] It is recorded by Dīnwarī that almost all members of Mukhtār's army in the battle with Damascus were Iranian masters.[4]

Describing Mukhtār's soldiers, the commander of the Damascus army stated, "O dwellers of Damascus! You do battle with slaves, those who had abandoned Islam and seceded from it, have no piety and speak not Arabic".[5]

Muḥammad Ibn Ash'ath, a nobleman, who had fled to Baṣra told Muṣ'ab, "Turks and Daylamites are all behind me".[6] A year later when the noble and Ibn Zubayr's supporters came into power in the town, Muṣ'ab issued the decree to wipe out the masters, for their blasphemousness was made public, their conceit had heightened and their humility before the Arabs had reduced.[7] Earlier it was quoted from Mughīra that if non-Arabs had been summoned towards Muḥammad's family and to a revenge for their blood, all would have congregated.[8] The victor was Mukhtār. A number of

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, p.501; al-Futūḥ, Vol.VI, p.107; "Daylamites" was a title for Iranian non-Muslims though the masters were Muslims mostly. This term was used by Muslim Arabs describing them as disbelievers in order to disdain them.

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.502; al-Futūḥ, Vol.VI, p.108

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.502

[4]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.293, see also p.306

[5]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.516

[6]. al-Futūḥ, Vol.VI, p.138

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, Vol.V, p.294; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, p.577

[8]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, Vol.V, p.223

noblemen ran away to Baṣra and some others secluded themselves at homes awaiting for divine predestination which came forth after a while.

The people of Kūfa swore allegiance to Mukhtār as an emir. Based on his Shi'ites belief he said, "Subsequent to swearing allegiance to 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib (a) and his family worthier than this one, I have sworn allegiance to no one else."[1] He enumerated what based on which their allegiance should be as, the divine Book, the Prophet's Sunna, revenge for Ahl al-Bayt's assassinations, Djihād against those transgressing the sacred limits, defense of the oppressed, a battle against the one battling them and a compromise with the one compromising with them.[2]

Mukhtār who had taken the power first of all made an attempt to establish national security. Then he eliminated all the elements playing negative roles in Karbalā. To absorb the nobles, he initially was so merciful to them that was suspected by the masters.[3] Nevertheless, referring to the point that his position-taking is in line with that of theirs, Mukhtār enlightened the masters declaring that such a behavior is transient.[4] Kūfa was deemed as a center for all cities in oriental Islamic lands and Northern Iraq. Such areas as Mūṣil, Ḥulwān (adjacent to Sar Pul Dhahāb), Ctesiphon as well as Armenian lands, Ādharbāydjān, Arrān, Ḥawrān, Māhiyān, Riy and Iṣfahān were ruled by Iraq.

Mukhtār's endeavor for keeping Kūfa secure did not last long as he learned that an army led by 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād had left Damascus to Kūfa. The army succeeding to defeating Tawwābīn and after a short break for clashing with Qays Ibn 'Aylān's tribe set out to Mūṣil.[5]

During the armed conflict between the three-thousand-soldier army dispatched by Mukhtār and 'Ubayd Allāh's six-thousand-soldier army, Rabi'a Ibn Mukhāriq, a commander, was killed and three hundred people were captured by Mukhtār's army. It was obvious however that these few numbers could never resist against the rival army. Accordingly Mukhtār sent another group with seven thousand people headed by Ibrāhīm Ibn Ashtar as a relief group.

Under no circumstances were the noble gratified with Mukhtār's governorship. It was firstly owing to Mukhtār's intention had been avenging

---

[1]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, p.508

[2]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, p.508; Ibn A'tham, Vol.VI, p.115

[3]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, p.508

[4]. Ibid. Vol.IV, p.509

[5]. Narrated by Ibn A'tham, Vol.VI, p.139; following its clash with Mukhtār, the army of Damascus returned and again in order to conquer Iraq, it set out to Djazīra and then to Mūṣil.

Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī's assassins among whom were the noble as central elements. Secondly, regarding his limited Shi'ites forces in Kūfa, Mukhtār had begun inviting the masters for cooperation and it as a matter of fact was equal to belittling the noblemen. When determined to reprove Mukhtār, there was nothing to be more intolerable than the booties he had devoted to Mawālī (freed slaves).[1]

Such objections were all made in Shabath Ibn Rib'ī's house.The deduction drawn was Shabath's visit with Mukhtār.

Meeting Mukhtār, he said, ... وأعظم الأشياء عليك أنكّ عمدت إلى عبيدنا وهم فيئنا الذين أفاء الله بهم فأخذتهم إليك ثم لم ترض بأخذهم حتى جعلتهم شركاء في فيئنا ولايحل لك في هذا دينك ولا يحمل بك في شرفك[2] "Your biggest shortcoming is that you rely upon our slaves, those whose looties belong to us. And you deprived us of what Allāh had bestowed us. It did not suffice you however, you also let them share in Bayt al-Māl. What you did was thoroughly contrary to both your religion and dignity."

The nobles' ultimatum was that they would never stop protesting unless Mukhtār committed to return Mawālī to them.

In return for their request, Mukhtār requested something about declining of which by the noblemen he was certain, it was whether they would declare their readiness to battle beside him against the Umayya and Ibn Zubayr or not.[3] Shabath who went to bring their answer never came back and it denoted that the noble were set to revolt.

The other reproof was about Mukhtār's and his followers' Shi'ism, that they all loathe اسلافنا الصالحين "Our competent forefathers."[4]

What they implied might had been that the Shi'ite Muslims reproached many of the Prophet's companions (for the deviations caused by them).

For consultation, the nobles went to 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Mikhnaf, warning them not to combat Mukhtār, he added, "All the valorous of the tribes are with him and moreover Mawālī who are as lion-hearted as Arabs and as revengeful as non-Arabs are with him". He urged them to await pending the arrival of troops from Baṣra (Ibn Zubayr) or Damascus. They balked at his proposal in view of the fact that at that time the majority of Mukhtār's adherents in particular Ibrāhīm Ibn Ashtar had left the town for Mūṣil. They imagined that it was a favorable occasion to win a victory over Mukhtār.

---

[1]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, p.518

[2]. Ibid. Vol.VI, p.146

[3]. Ibid. Vol.VI, p.146

[4]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, p.518

No sooner had the army commanded by Ibrāhīm arrived in Ctesiphon than a wave of rioting was triggered off. As soon as Mukhtār noticed that the situation was critical, he sent for Ibrāhīm to return Kūfa. In order to keep them occupied, he himself began futile negotiations with the insurgents.[1] One day to Ibrāhīm's entry, the clasnes flared up. Both Ibrāhīm's haste to return and Mukhtār's withstanding led to Mukhtār's triumph and the nobles' debacle. In this war, Mukhtār's army sustained 135 casualties whereas it was 640 for the foe.

The nobles' insurrection made Mukhtār, who had taken no action in revenge for Ahl al-Bayt's blood hopeful about absorbing the nobles, adopt a measure. His first action was the killing of 284 captives seized in the war with the nobles. Reported by eye-witnesses, they had been among the participants in Karbalā.

Mukhtār announced then, إنه من أغلق با به فهو آمن الا رجلا شرك في دم آل محمد (ص) "Anyone staying at his home is secure unless he has aided and abetted the ones streaming the prophet's descendants' blood."

The noblemen, who were confident that Mukhtār would beyond the shadow of a doubt apprehend and slaughter them this time, fled to Baṣra and another group concealed themselves in Kūfa. Mukhtār had promulgated, ما من دينا ترك قوم قتلوا الحسين يعيشون أحياء في الارض "Permitting Ḥusayn's assassins to go on living freely on the earth is never ever passable in our religion."

Its implication was their murder. Recollecting those collaborating in Karbalā, Mukhtār's supporters brought them to him one after another. He also cut the arms of some and the legs of some others in order to kill them.[2] It is estimated that the men charged with participating in the event of Karbalā were approximately three thousand.[3] Among the figures targeted was Shimr Ibn Dhi l-Djawshan who was murdered by Mukhtār's envoys while escaping to Baṣra. As a rule of thumb, 'Umar Ibn Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, the commander, pleaded guilty as the main culprit. From the outset of his responsibility- when busy with absorbing the nobles-Mukhtār had given a guarantee of clemency to him stipulating that he were secure provided that he should under no conditions attend an incident against him, الا أذا أحد ث حاد ث. In the throes of recent adventures when he was arrested too, he showed his guarantee of clemency. He was said,nevertheless, that the stipulated condition could include any incident even flight of a pigeon or entry and exit from house!

---

[1]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, Vol.VI, p.149

[2]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.VI, p.343 ('Izz al-dīn publication) أمّا أمان المختار لعمر بن سعد الا أن يحدث حدثا فأنّه كان يريد به أذا دخل الخلاء واحدث...

[3]. Ibid. Vol.VI, p.139

Not only 'Umar Ibn Sa'd's doom was death but also his son was killed as well. The heads of both were sent to Medina. The former one was in revenge for Imām Ḥusayn's blood and the latter for 'Alī Akbar's, the eldest son.[1] Narratedly, it was the one and the only day Imām Sadjdjād (a) was seen smiling,[2] since he had always been with a sorrowful expression weeping up to that very time. Both Ṭabarī and Ibn A'tham have recounted the murders of various individuals in detail.

The latest phenomena drew certain boundaries. Shi'ite Muslims seceded from other parties completely. For the time being, Mukhtār's support was merely the Shi'ite Muslims although he had been striving to absorb from al parties. In the opposite front were the Umayya adherents in addition to Ibn Zubayr's devotees. Their number was not low. Many traveled to Baṣra and many others stayed looking forward to a golden opportunity. At the same time, Mukhtār intended to intensify his efforts to engross the attention.

Giving a description of Mukhtār's conduct, the historians stated, وكان ... مختار أوّل من ظَهَر أحسن شيء سيرة تالفاً للناس[3] "He was the first one behaving in the best way. He invariably prompted people to befriend one another."

According to Ibn A'tham, وأحبّه الناس حُباً شديداً[4] "People were attached to him."

Balādhurī narrated, وأحسن المختار مجاورة أهل الكوفة والسيرة فيهم[5] "Mukhtār was the best for the Kūfiyāns with his best conducts."

It definitively was concerned with the Shi'ite Muslims not those with whom Mukhtār was wrathful. In regard to this reason it is said, كان عبد الله بن جعدة أكرم خلق الله علي المختار لقرابته من عليٍّ (ع)[6] "'Abd Allāh Ibn Dju'da was held dear by Mukhtār on account of his kinship with 'Alī (a)."

Having resolved the internal points at issue through suppression of the noble and the ones affiliated to the Umayya and Ibn Zubayr, Mukhtār anticipated how to broaden the realm of his governorship.

Baṣra known as a haven for the fugitives from Kūfa and a stronghold for the pro-Ibn Zubayr persons in Iraq had drawn Mukhtār's attention but it could naturally be a focal point of potential peril. His action might have been in a bid to absorb the Shi'ite Muslims there although few. The leader of

---

1. al-Futūḥ, Vol.VI, p.123

2. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, Vol.II, p.259

3. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, p.53

4. al-Futūḥ, Vol.VI, p.120

5. Ansāb al-ashrāf, Vol.V, pp.228-229; Maqidasī narrated that Mukhtār had done his best to absorb as many people as possible. See also, al-Bad' wa l-tārīkh, Vol.VI, p.22.

6. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, p.531

such Shi'ite Muslims was Makhraba Ibn Muthannā who had assisted the penitents but could not arrive at the battle in time. Swearing allegiance to Mukhtār, he was commissioned to proceed and incite the people in Baṣra to a riot against Ibn Zubayr. In Baṣra, Muthannā gathered a group from his tribe along with other residents. In a clash, nearly forty soldiers from Muthannā's army were dead. Later on, with Aḥnaf Ibn Qays's intercession, Muthannā could return Kūfa with his a few-remained people.[1]

Another spot which had become center of Mukhtār's attention was Ḥidjāz, namely Ibn Zubayr's main base. At that time an attack by Damascus from Wasidi al-Qurā was imminent. Mukhtār plotted to send an army to exercise control over Medina under the pretext of obviating the threat of Damascus. Ibn Zubayr consented. A three-thousand-member army of which seven hundred were only Arabs[2] set out to Ḥidjāz. Ibn Zubayr, by no means over confident about Mukhtār, dispatched an army to Medina recommending that they should get along with them on the condition that they were convinced to be supervised; otherwise, it was imperative that they be suppressed immediately. On the other hand, Mukhtār, reluctant to unvail his real scheme, recommended the commander that a message dash carrier take his mandates to them when convenient.

Prior to the communication of Mukhtār's mandates, Ibn Zubayr's army clashed with Mukhtār's. By virtue of the fact that they did not yield to Ibn Zubayr's army as the commander they were assaulted. Many were killed and many had to flee. Mukhtār's genuine intention which wPas revealed, later in his letter to Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya was, فإني بعثت إليك جنداً ليذلّوا لك الأعداء وليحوزوا لك البلاد "I sent my army for the purpose of overthrowing your opponents and conquer the land."

The letter did manifest that his aim had been eliminating Ahl al-Bayt's foes and liberating Ḥidjāz for the Shi'ite Muslims'sovereignty. Responding the letter for asking his permission to deploy a large army to Medina, in addition to lauding him and his intent, Ibn Ḥanafiyya wrote, "If I were bent on combating, there would be many a person ready to join me but I have secluded myself."[3]

Afterwards when Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya and a group from the Hāshimites were in Mecca, Ibn Zubayr aimed to secure allegiance from them menacingly. Demurring, they were threatened to be imprisoned and burned to death. How dauntless! Ibn Zubayr had realized that without their allegiance consolidation of his sovereignty over other lands would be

---

[1]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, pp.536, 537

[2]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, p.542

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, Vol.III, p.282

beyond the realm of possibility. The other side of the coin was that their allegiance might unstablize Mukhtār's position as Muḥammad Ḥanafiyya's representative in Kūfa.

Once 'Urwa Ibn Zubayr, the pretender to religious jurisprudence, was objected in this regard, he reacted as stating, "My brother's intention is to establish unity and to avert discord among Muslims". It was exactly as 'Umar Ibn Khaṭṭāb secured allegiance from the Hāshimites for Abū Bakr by laying logs on their doorsteps.[1] Ibn Ḥanafiyya who felt the status insecure wrote to Mukhtār to help them out.[2] Mukhtār dispatched nearly one hundred and fifty people group by group, in order not to be identified, to Mecca to emancipate the Hāshimites with no clash with the slogan of, يا لثارات حسين[3]

They moved to Zamzam wherein the prison was located and released them after all. Both Ibn Zubayr and the sent group by Mukhtār refrained from any conflict which would certainly culminate in bloodshedding in Divine Shrine. Since this group had entered Mecca with sticks (not swords) had been named "Khashabiyya".[4]

Mukhtār's the most remarkable action was his confrontation with the army of Damascus. It occurred between Mukhtār's dispatched army led by Ibrāhīm Ibn Ashtar and an army commanded by 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād. A great number of prominent leaders of Damascus taken part in various battles against Iraq so far were killed during the fight among whom were 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād, Ḥusayn Ibn Numayr Sukūnī and Shuraḥbīl Ibn Dhi l-Kilā'. The remaining of the army while limping and running away wandered through Mūṣil.

The Kūfiyān fugitives were the main elements causing Muṣ'ab Ibn Zubayr's invasion to Kūfa. Through incitement, they could flourish to impel Muṣ'ab Ibn Zubayr to suppress Mukhtār and the Kūfa into control too. Such individuals as Muḥammad Ibn Ash'ath Ibn Qays, one of Imām Ḥusayn's assassins, were among the commanders of Ibn Zubayr's troops while attacking Kūfa. Excluding them there were a number delegated to propagate against Mukhtār amongst people.[5] Ibrāhīm Ibn Ashtar, governing Mūṣil, did never declare his readiness to return to Kūfa and back Mukhtār, furthermore. Reassuring how the fugitive noblemen had prompted other sinners to uproot

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, Vol.III, p. 282

[2]. Ibid. Vol.II, p. 283; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.IV, p.250

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.282

[4]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, Vol.IV, p.455; Murūdj al-dhahab, Vol.III, p.99; Ansāb al-ashrāf, Vol.III, p.285; Vol.V, p.231, it has been said that they had taken the logs being repaired for burning Ibn Ḥanafiyya and others from the Hāshimites by Ibn Zubayr.

[5]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 559

the right and let the wrong replace it, Mukhtar attempted to mobilize the Kūfiyān.[1] When both rivals met one another face to face, those on Ibn Zubayr's side proposed that Mukhtār's forces relinguish fighting by swearing allegiance to 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr as "Amir al-Mu'minin". Those on Mukhtār's side also urged them to swear allegiance to Mukhtār and entrust "the Messenger's family" with the caliphate.[2]

At this juncture, the commander of pro-Ibn Zubayr soldiers was Muhallab Ibn Abī Ṣufra and Mukhtār's was Aḥmar Ibn Shumayṭ. Muḥammad Ibn Ash'ath was the commander of the fugitives from Kūfa to Baṣra. The clashes terminated in Ibn Zubayr's favor which preceded Mukhtār's and his follower's martyrdom.

Earlier we provided you with plentiful evidence averring Mukhtār's and his adherents' belief in Shi'ism as well as their indescribable devotion to Ahl al-Bayt in a way that it is by all means beyond any doubt historically. Moreover there are available proofs indicating Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya's support which thoroughly substantiates Mukhtār's uprising, relative, however. Mukhtār's personal standing taken in revenge for the Umayya and the noble elucidates how he jeopardized his position with apprehension and murder of Imām Ḥusayn's assassins.

Inasmuch as he struck the Umayya hard for several times and also called the legitimacy of Ibn Zubayr's governorship into question, they exerted themselves to make him the target of any kind of charges at all costs. The accusations were his claim of "Prophethood" for himself, "Mahdavitism" for Ibn Ḥanafiyya, founding the sect of the Kīssanids and the most common one was the label of "liar" (Kadhdhāb) which has been referred to in all sources.[3] Almost all of these accusations, in accordance with a researcher, were ascribed to Mukhtār after his martyrdom*.

Assuming that Mukhtār had committed some errors but it ought to be borne in mind that the pivotal factor in his indictment had been thanks to the strokes the Umayya and Ibn Zubayr had experienced on the part of him.

As soon as the news of Mukhtār's martyrdom was heard, Ibn Zubayr informed Ibn 'Abbās, ألم يبلغك قتل الكذاب "Have you heard not the news of the liar's death?"

"The liar?" asked Ibn 'Abbās.

"Mukhtār, I mean", Ibn Zubayr replied. "It seems that you do not feel like calling him the liar".

---

[1]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī. vol.IV, p. 559

[2]. Ibid. vol.IV, p. 560

[3]. See 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.V, p. 300

*. Hadgson, How did the early shia become sectarian?, p. 3.

Ibn 'Abbās said, ذلك رجل قتل قتلتنا وطلب بدمائنا وشفى صدورنا وليس جزاءه منا الشتم والشماتة[1] "He is the one who had killed our assassins, has taken revenge for our blood and has soothed our pains. The reward of such a person in our sight is not insulation."

Elsewhere when once more the name of Mukhtār was mentioned before Ibn 'Abbās, he said, صلى عليه كرام الكاتبون[2] "The two illustrious writers send their regards to him."

It is reported that Ibn 'Abbās, Ibn Ḥanafiyya and even Ibn 'Umar never returned Mukhtār's sent presents.[3]

Once 'Ubayd Allāh's head was carried to 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn (a) in Medina, he stated, لم يبق من بني هاشم أحد إلا قام بخطبة في الثناء علي المختار والدعاء له وجميل القول فيه "There was no one from the Hāshimites who did not make a sermon complimenting Mukhtār and praying for him."

Kashshī has quoted Imām Bāqir (a) as saying, لا تسبّوا المختار فانّه قتل قتلتنا وطلب ثارنا وزوّج ارامنا وقسّم فينا المال علي العسرة[4] "Insult not Mukhtār owing to the fact that he has killed our assassins, has taken revenge on them, has had our orphans marry and contributed us financially when in trouble."

As commented by himself, Ibn Zubayr who had borne Ahl al-Bayt's grudge for forty years[5] could on no accounts stand Mukhtār's presence whose endeavor was in line with Ahl al-Bayt's governorship. And the Umayya enmity was truly overt how he agitated the leaders of Damascus to battle with Mukhtār.

Sufficient would be if we quote Ṭabarī and others regarding Mukhtār's devotedness. Succeeding his martyrdom, his two wives, one of whom Nu'mān Ibn Bashīr Anṣārī's daughter and the other was Samura Ibn Djundab's daughter, were interrogated. They latter confessed that her ideas about him were like those of theirs! However, the former said, انّه كان عبداً من عباد الله الصالحين "He was a servant from Allāh's pious servants."

Confining her, Muṣ'ab wrote to Ibn Zubayr, "This woman is of the opinion that her husband, Mukhtār, has been a prophet!"

In the answer, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr commanded him to slay her.[6]

---

[1].Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.287; Vol.V, p.265

[2]. Ibid. Vol.V, p.267

[3]. Ibid. Vol.V, p.270

[4]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p. 125; for other hadiths in this regard, refer to Bahjat al-āmāl, vol.VII, p.

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p. 291

[6]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 574; Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 264; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 99

The worst accusation Mukhtār was leveled was his claim to be a prophet. Such a charge is totally baseless. Its roots can be located in an utterance the historians have quoted from Mukhtār mostly in rhymed prose (most of which have been narrated by Ṭabarī and others).[1] Another accusation was that he had introduced himself a diviner and had carried out what the prophets had done.[2] We believe that these remarks do him an injustice although it never implies that he had been infallible.

Socially, the novelty of Mukhtār's uprising was due to Mawālī's presence and except one case which was limited compared with Khāridjites, it was an absolutely new phenomenon. Previous to his uprising, hardly ever did Mawālī have roles in the Arabic society of Iraq though they had been promoted scientifically in the late first century A.H. It was Mukhtār's uprising which cleared the way for the appearance of Mawālī as an applicable and considerable force in Iraq. By reason of their participation in Mukhtār's movement, they were severely suppressed, however, they could play an effective role within the community. What many had suggested Muṣ'ab Ibn Zubayr was, أقتل هولاء الموالي فانهم قد بدء كفرهم وعظم كبرهم وقلّ شكرهم[3] "Massacre all Mawālī for they have revealed their disbelief, have heightened their conceit and lessened their gratitude."

Reportedly, six thousands of them were slaughtered by Muṣ'ab!

The Next events pending the extinction of the Umayya dynasty proved that the Iranian Mawālīs' development had been originated from the time of Mukhtār onwards and their role in the Islamic community reached the pinnacle by coming into power by Banū 'Abbās. Deeming them minacious, 'Abd al-Malik planned to avert their likely insurrection through paying much more heed to them. By the same token be enlarged their proportion of Bayt al-Māl more than what allotted by Mu'āwiya.[4]

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, pp. 233, 235, 236

[2]. An example was a narration about "throne". Mukhtār has been quoted as telling his followers a lie, "Bring 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib's throne". Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, pp.241,242

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV. P.577

[4]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.IV, p.148

CHAPTER IX
IMĀM SADJDJĀD (A)

IMĀM SADJDJĀD(A)

'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib, known as Sadjdjād, the fourth Shi'ites Imām, was as maintained in one narration born in 38A.H. and poisoned by Walīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik in 94 A.H.[1] If the narrated date of birth be true, Imām should have evidently perceived both Imām 'Alī and Imām Mudjtabā as well as Imām Ḥusayn (a) and realized how Mu'āwiya had been exercising pressure on the Shi'ite Muslims living in Iraq and other lands. In the light of the reports narrated from the event of Ṭaff (Karbalā) a number of writers concluded that Imām's age must have been less than what reported ands his year of birth had been 48. Such reports forebode that following Imām Ḥusayn's martyrdom some were determined to assassinate Imām Sadjdjād (a) also, but they were impeded due to his immaturity.

Ḥumayd Ibn Muslim, present in Karbalā, said, "When Shimr came to kill Imām Sadjdjād, I dissuaded him saying he was a little boy".[2]

Found in another version when 'Ubayd Allāh decided to murder Imām Sadjdjād (a), he commanded to examine the signs of his maturity. After they attested to it, he issued the verdict of his murder. Notwithstanding, Imām managed to change his mind by saying him "If you claim that you are from among the Prophte's kins (as Abū Sufyān's grandson), you are obliged to let a man accompany these women to Medina".[3]

It is also quoted that Zaynab (a) averted Imām Sadjdjād's murder saying "kill me first if you want to kill him".[4] Enumerating the Umayya atrocities, Djāḥiz has alluded to their irreverence about Imām Sadjdjād (a) by checking the signs of his maturity after the event of Karbalā.[5] Supposing the narration

---

[1]. al-Itḥāf bi ḥubb al-áshrāf, p. 143; the date of martyrdom reported by Mas'ūdī is 95; see also Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 160

[2]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 229 ('Izz al-dīn publication)

[3]. Ibid. vol.V, p.231

[4]. Ibid. vol.V. P.231

[5]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd,Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XV, p.236

true[1], Imām should have been younger since the maximum age of maturity was fifteen necessitated by the current situation.

Although such kinds of reports are recorded in various sources, there exists many a proof of hand which denies them. First, the renowned historians have recorded Imām's birth in 38, based on which Imām had been twenty-three years of age in the course of Karbalā event. Secondly, it had by not means been ignored by the expert historians, from the very beginning they contradicted the common narration the genuineness of which had been confirmed and come into question however.

Muḥammad Ibn 'Umar Wāqidī, a distinguished narrator of the Sunnis, subsequent to a quotation from Imām Ṣādiq (a) as saying "'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn (a) departed in 58" added that this utterance vindicated that while 23 or 24, Imām Sadjidjād (a) had been with his father in Karbalā and those describing him under age are wrong. Imām was seriously ill in Karbalā; therefore, he was not able to participate in the war. How could he ever be immature whereas his son, Abū Dja'far Muḥammad Ibn 'Alī Bāqir, had met Djābir Ibn 'Abd Allāh Anṣārī and quoted hadiths from him. Djābir had passed away in 78 A.H.[2]

Thirdly, the way of Imām Sadjidjād's behaving towards 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād and even Yazīd Ibn Abī Sufyān corroborates that he had been old enough and to discuss his maturity or immaturity in Karbalā looked in vain. The scene set for his delivering sermons on the pulpit, in its turn, stemmed from his age as well. Such a ground could have never been prepared by Yazīd for an individual whose maturity was open to question.

Fourthly, with a glance at numerous narrations about Imām Bāqir's birth in historical books, it can be observed that he had been present in Karbalā as a four-year old boy. No one has declared it untrue. If assenting these reports, there is no alternative but admitting the common narration with a two-year-or-so discrepancy.

Three versions that certain figures like Biyhaqī have recorded telling Imām's date of birth (33, 36 and 38) are not unconnected to that mentioned above. The former was reported by Ibn 'Asākir.[3] Zuhrī also has confirmed

---

[1]. 'Alī Ibn al-Ḥusayn, Sayyid Dja'far Shahīdī, pp. 32, 33

[2]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.V, p.222; Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.XVII, p.256; Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II, p.191. Not only can Djābir's demise be a cogent reason for Imām Bāqir's birth before the event of Karbalā, although it weakens the probability of his birth after Karbalā. Waqidī's reasoning has been the report of Imām Bāqir's birth not his visit with Djābir.

[3]. Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.XVII, p.230

that 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn was beside his father in Karbalā at the age of twenty-three.[1]

Another controversial issue the analysis where of would bear fruitful results is the accurate name and pedigree of Imām Sadjdjād's mother. Regretfully, after all extensive studies that a number of writers have done in this respect, it is not still definite. The notion that his mother had been one of Sassanids princesses was recently denied lest the anti-Shi'ite Muslims as a consequence judge that the spread of Shi'ism in Iran had been due to the association of Imām's lineage with the Sassanids through Yazdgard III's daughter who has been alleged to be Imām Sadjdjād's mother. Professor Shahīdī, in his foregoing book, has cited and criticized most of these narrations. Further, there are few quotations suggesting that she be "Umm Walad" (a bondswoman whose husband was not a bondsman). In spite of all controversies about the reports or their incompatibility with the reports of the contests and so forth, the genuine narration is definitively worthy and is mentioned in the Shi'ites books belonging to the ancient times such as Waq'a Ṣiffīn, Tārīkh Ya'qūbī and Baṣā'ir al-Daradjāt, all written in the third century. A hadith also has been quoted from Imām Ṣādiq(a) in Kāfī[2]as reported by Qāḍī Nu'mān in the fourth century as well.[3] Acknowledging that there does exist skepticism, we shall examine the illusory link between this issue and the spread of Shi'ism properly later.[4]

Consistent with what the Shi'ites hadith-narrators have narrated, Imām Sadjdjād (a) is the successor of his father, Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī (a). These are narrated by Shiykh Kulaynī in Kāfī and Shiykh Ḥurr 'Āmilī in Ithbāt al-Hudāt, etc. It can also be detected from the Prophet's hadiths naming the Shi'ites Imāms. Heedless of it, approving Imām Sadjdjād (a) in Shi'ites community as well as his Imāma throughout history is an original proof itself. The one and the only mistrust at that critical point prevailing a small number of Ahl al-Bayt's supporters was Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya's Imamate which will be discussed in berries later. As specified by Shi'ites hadiths, the Prophet's sword, armor and so on should be with Imāms and their being with Imām Sadjdjād was validated even in Sunnites books.[5] The time at which Imām Sadjdjād lived was a special period that all religious values were exposed to the Umayya distortin and Medina residents, one of the religious centers, were all compelled to swear allegiance to Yazīd like his slaves. Islamic commandments had turned into a plaything for people

---

[1]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq. p.231

[2]. al-Kāfī, vol.II, p.369

[3]. Sharḥ al-akhbār, vol.III, p.266

[4]. See a concise paper about the relation between Shī'ism and Iran, Iṣfahān, 1365.

[5]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.I, pp.486, 488

such as Ibn Ziyād, Ḥadidjādj and 'Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwān. In Ḥadidjādj's view, 'Abd al-Malik was superior to Allāh's Messenger (s)! Unlike Islamic narrations, he extorted "Djizya" (poll-tax) from Muslims and with a slight calumny he handed over them to the executioners.

In the shadow of such rule it was inevitable that the less people's religious training was elevated, the more disvalues were revived. Under those circumstances, Imām Sadjdjād (a) was only a worshipper and his most socially penetrating impact on establishing a link between people and Allāh was solely through Du'ā (prayer). So influential a characteristic had he that people were enamored of him. A large number of knowledge-seekers were the narrators of his hadiths and availed themselves of his overflowing spring emanated from the Prophet and 'Alī's boundless body of knowledge. Describing Imām's personality, Muḥammad Ibn Sa'd, Sunnites historian and scholar, had said, كان علي بن الحسين ثقة مأمونا كثير الحديث عالياً رفيعاً ورعاً[1] "'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn, trustworthy, said many hadiths. He was magnanimous, superior and pious."

In his thesis about the reliability of this unique narration, Shāfī'ī had written, وجدت علي بن الحسين – وهو أفقه أهل المدينة – يعوّل علي خبر الواحد[2] "'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn who was the only outstanding religious jurisprudent in Medina relied upon this unique narration."

Although Ibn Shahāb Zuhrī was from the Umayya kins and regardless of the dispute existing between the Umayya and Shi'ite Muslims, he was among the scholars at Imām Sadjdjād's time. Getting zealously the most out of Imām's presence, he had praised him in many sentences. In a letter written by Imām, Zuhrī was advised to reconsider his position as an instrument for the Umayya sovereignty.[3] Once he was reproached by Imām Sadjdjād for his insultation to 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib (s)[4]; however, he was his narrator and his narrations have been recorded in various books.[5] Additionally he was enamored with Imām Sadjdjād's worshipping and purity. As reported, كان الزهري إذا ذكر علي بن الحسين يبكي ويقول: زين العابدين[6] "As soon as Zuhrī heard the name of 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn, he wept and said, Zayn al-'Ābidīn the worshippers' beauty."

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd,Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XV, p. 274

[2]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.V, p.222

[3]. Tuḥaf al-'Uqūl, p. 200

[4]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.IV, p. 102

[5]. For instance see Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol. VIII, p. 172; Ḥilyat al-awliyā', Vol.III, p. 86; Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II, p. 103

[6]. Ḥilyat al-awliyā', vol.III, p. 135

He was quoted as saying, علي بن الحسين أعظم الناس منّة عليّ[1] "'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn was the most generous of all people." ما رأيت أحداً أفقه من علي بن الحسين[2] "I have seen no one being more erudite than 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn."

His commendation for Imām Sadjdjād (a) was to the extent that some of the Marwānids told him, يا زهري! مافعل نبيّك يعني علي بن الحسين[3] "O Zuhrī! What has your Prophet ('Alī Ibn Ḥusayn) done for you?"

Abū Ḥāzim, another hadith-narrator, had said, ما رأيت هاشمياً أفضل من علي بن الحسين ولا أفقه منه[4] "I have seen no one from the Hāshimites whose Knowledge and jurisprudence be higher than those of 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn."

It is quoted from Djāḥiẓ as stating, "Concerning 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn's characteristic, the Shi'ite Muslims, schismatics, the Khāridjites were all unanimous and not a single one of those was sceptical about his superiority over others".[5]

As it will be discerned later, the most decisive reason for Imām's popularity with the people was his eloquent sentences within the framework of supplication engrossing people.

Sa'īd Ibn Musayyib, an eminent hadith-narrator, described Imām Sadjdjād (a), ما رأيت أورع من علي بن الحسين[6] "I have never seen one more pious than 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn so far."

During his lifetime, Imām was called "'Alī al-Khayr" (example of goodness), "'Alī al-Aqharr (outstanding 'Alī) and "'Alī al-'Ābid" (Worshipper).[7] At that time Mālik Ibn Anas was of this belief that there existed no one like Imām Sadjdjād in the Prophet's Ahl al-Bayt.[8]

Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd had said, كان علي بن الحسين غاية في العبادة[9] "'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn was the highest in worshipping."

On account of Imām's too many prostrations as well as of which mark on his forehead he was called "Dhi l-Thafanāt" (the Owner of Calluses).[10]

---

1. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.V, p. 214
2. Zayn al-Ābidīn, Sayyid al-Ahl, p. 43
3. Sharḥ al-akhbār, vol. III, p. 258
4. Tadhkirat al-khawāṣ, p. 186; Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II, p. 80
5. 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p. 193
6. Ḥilyat al-awliyā', vol.III, p. 141; Kashf al-ghumma, Vol.II, p. 80; Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol. XVII, p. 236; Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb, vol.VII, p. 305; Siyar a'lām al-nubalā', vol.IV, p. 391
7. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XV, p. 273
8. Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb, vol.VII, p. 305
9. Ibid. Vol.I, p. 27
10. Mu'djam al-udabā',, vol.XI, p. 103

Also, Ibn Ḥibbān had described Imām as follows, وكان من أفاضل بني هاشم من فقهاء المدينة وعبادهم ... يقال علي بن الحسين سيد العابدين في ذلك الزمان[1] "He was one of the most learned of the Hāshimites, one of the jurisprudents and worshippers of Medina ... it is said that he was the master of worshippers at that time."

Abū Zuhra also said, فعليّ زين العابدين كان إمام المدينة نبلاً وعلمًا[2] "'Alī Zayn al-'Ābidīn was Imām of Medina from the viewpoint of rank and knowledge."

Reportedly, when Imām made ablution before prayer, he was noticed with a pale complexion. After being inquired for the reason, he replied, أتدرون بين يدي من أريدأ أن أقوم[3] "Do you know before whom I am going to stand?"

It is recounted that at prayer time Imām began shivering while turning pale. In his answer to the question for its ground, he stated, اني أريد الوقوف بين يدي ملك عظيم[4] "I want to stand in front of the Great King."

Heeded to nothing while he was engaged in performing prayers. Once his child broke his arm. He was crying severely. An orthopedist was called to set the bone. Later, after finding the child with his arm hung from his neck, Imām realized the happening after all.[5]

Zamakhsharī has narrated that when 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn immersed his arm to make ablution, ثم رفع رأسه الى السماء والقمر والكواكب، ثم جعل يفكّر في خلقها حتي أصبح وأذن المؤذن ويده في الماء "He raised his head staring at the sky, the moon and stars and pondering over as long as morning appeared and the Mu'adhdhin started calling to prayer while his arm was still in water."[6]

When his servant was questioned about him, she said, "Never ever did I take him food during the day nor did I prepare bed for him at nights."[7] It is narrated that while he was busy with his prayers, a snake approached him. The snake crept along through Imām's two feet but not a slight move or change of complexion was noticed.[8]

In giving alms and aiding the underprivileged he was proverbial. It was after his martyrdom when it revealed that a hundred families had been living

---

[1]. al-thiqāt, vol.V, p. 160

[2]. al-imām al-Ṣādiq, p. 22

[3]. Ṣifat al-ṣafwa, vol.II, p. 55; Nūr al-abṣār, p. 127; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, Vol.V, p. 216; al-Itḥāf, p. 136; al-Fuṣūl al-muhimma, p. 201, al-'Iqd al-farīd, Vol.III, p. 114

[4]. Sharḥ al-akhbār, vol.III, p. 258

[5]. Ibid. vol.III, p. 263

[6]. Rabi' al-abrār, vol.III, pp. 160, 163

[7]. A'immatunā, vol.I, p. 263, Manāqib Ibn Shahr Āshūb, vol.II, p. 255

[8]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadid. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.X, p. 159

on his alms and charity.[1] Imām Bāqir (a) has been quoted as saying that his father, Imām Sadjdjād (a), had been carrying food on his back at dead of night for the destitute stressing that charity at night-time mitigates Allāh's wrath.[2] People's affection for him beggared description. Narratedly, the Qur'ān reciters under on conditions set out to Mecca unless Imām Sadjdjād came and one thousand people on horseback followed him.[3]

Sumptuously dressed, he left home but promptly returned and asked to bring his previous robe pointing out, "As though I am not 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn."[4] While he was passing the streets in Medina on horseback, not once did he ever warn "let me through" in view of the fact that he believed that the route was communal and he was never entitled to outrun.[5] His son, Imām Bāqir, was cited as saying, "My father sacrificed his properties entirely for Allāh's sake twice".[6]

At the moment of breathing his last, Muḥammad Ibn Usāma Ibn Zayd was beside him. Muḥammad was shedding tears when Imām asked the why.

"I am 15000 dhms in debt", responded Muḥammad.

"Do not agitate yourself, I pay it", Imām stated.[7]

All of these mentioned points look a drop from the ocean of Imām Sadjdjād's virtues.

IMĀM SADJDJĀD AND SHI'ITE MUSLIMS

On the last day of the event of Karbalā the Shi'ites's political and ideological position was in a tragic situation both qualitatively and quantitatively. Kūfa which had always been considered the center of Shi'ites tendencies had turned into a base for suppressing them. All the vertical

---

[1]. Ḥilyat al-awliyā', Vol.III, p. 136; Kashf al-ghumma, Vol.II, pp. 78; Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, Vol.XVII, p. 238.

[2]. Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol. XVII, p. 238

[3]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p. 117

[4]. Makārim al-Akhlāq, p. 58; Wasā'il al-shī'a, vol.II, p. 364; It is also narrated that he occasionally wore impressive dress lest people might assume that he acted contrary to what Allāh had ordered. قُلْ مَنْ حَرَّمَ زِينَةَ اللهِ الَّتِي أَخْرَجَ لِعِبَادِهِ وَالطَّيِّبَاتِ مِنَ الرِّزْقِ. "Say, who has prohibited the embellishment of Allāh which he has brought forth for these servants?" See Tafsīr al-ayyāshī, vol.II, p. 15, the second hadith; Mustadrak al-wasā'il, vol.III, p.203

[5]. Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol. XVII, p. 246

[6]. Ibid. vol.XVII, p. 238

[7]. Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.XVII, p. 239; Sharḥ al-akhbār, vol.III, pp. 261-262 (His name is mentioned Zayd Ibn Usāma Ibn Zayd in the second one)

Shi'ite Muslims of Imām Ḥusayn having been either in Medina, or in Mecca or those from Kūfa who could flourish to join Imām were martyred in Karbalā. Although there were some living in Kūfa, they could in no way express themselves under the appalling circumstances exercised by Ibn Ziyād. Karbalā was as a matter of fact a debacle for the Shi'ite Muslims psychologically. What was seemingly publicized was that the Shi'ite Muslims could no longer raise their heads aloft. A group of Ahl al-Bayt headed by Imām Ḥusayn had achieved martyrdom and the only remainng son from Imām Ḥusayn and Fāṭima's issue was no one but Imām Sadjdjād who was not famed at that time. Imām Ḥusayn's eldest son, 'Alī Akbar, haf also been martyred in particular. Imām Sadjdjād's life in Medina and being distant from Iraq did never allow opportunities to be provided for him to lead the Shi'ite Muslims in Kūfa.

In such a status which Shi'ites basis was determinedly targeted. Imām Sadjdjād had to resume from Zero and absorb people towards Ahl al-Bayt, Imām could successfully reach many achievements, however.[1]

The achievements have been verified in history. Imām Sadjdjād could not only breath new life into the Shi'ite Muslims but also lay the foundations for both Imām Bāqir's and Imām Ṣādiq's future activities. It has been evidenced by history that he, during his thirty-four-year activity, extricated the Shi'ite Muslims from the thorniest periods of their lives, the period which had nothing save Shi'ite Muslims' suppression by the Umayya and Ibn Zubayr. Ḥadjdjādj's twenty-year sovereignty in Iraq together with 'Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwān's dominance of the thorough Islamic realm had concentrated on suppressing the Shi'ite Muslims and somewhere else suppressing other Umayyads opponents including Khāridjites and such insurgents as 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Ash'ath. Hearing the term of Shi'ites was far more irritating than the term of disbeliever for Ḥadjdjādj.[2]

During these years, two Shi'ites movements were waged in Iraq either of which-despite the temporary victory of one-was defeated. Subsequently the Shi'ite Muslims were with all might put under the threat of murder, torture and imprisonment by the Umayya. The penitents one of the movements was that of Tawwābīn led by Sulaymān Ibn Ṣurad Khuzā'ī with a small number of the renowned Shi'ite Muslims of Kūfa that we already discussed. It is alleged that Tawwābīn had yielded to 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn's Imāma.[3] We could

---

[1]. Dirāsāt wa Buḥūth fi l-tārīkh wa l-islām, Vol.I, p.61 (lst edition) the paper of al-imām Sadjdjād Bā'ith al-islām min djadīd

[2]. See Imām Bāqir's remarks in Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha of Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Vol.XI, p.44; al-imām al-Ṣādiq of Abū Zuhra, pp.111-112

[3]. Tashayyu' dar masīr tārīkh, p.286

find no proof for the allegation in primary sources. What is worth consideration is that as a rule Tawwābīn had been set to entrust Imāma to Ahl al-Bayt if succeeded and naturally there existed no one from Fāṭima's issue but 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn (a). Not a report has been traced in history whether they were precisely of this opinion or not. It appears that no specific political relation between Imām Sadjdjād and Tawwābīn had been established. Nevertheless, whatever had given Shi'ites spirit to the movement was the active participation of the notable Shi'ite Muslims of Kūfa as well as its sentimental nature, that is, repenting for not defending Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī and getting martyred as the only way for the acceptance of their repentance. Nowhere of the movement was the name of Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya mentioned.

Their poletical blunder was assessing not the status quo, abandoning Kūfa and leaving himself to the accidents. Believing that the leader of the movement was incapable of estimating military and political issues, not only Mukhtār did by no means collaborate but he also hindered a number of Shi'ite Muslims to back the movement.

Imām Sadjdjād's association with the second movement, namely Mukhtār's movement was as vague as the former one. Such a connection bore numerous troubles both form the viewpoints of politics and ideology. It was said that after attaining support from the Shi'ite Muslims in Kūfa, Mukhtār pleaded to 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn (a) for cooperation but Imām showed no delight.[1] By taking Imām's abiding policy into account, the standing adopted looked reasonable. Later than the event in Karbalā, Imām had well perceived that reviving such a dead community through securing the leadership was beyond the bounds of practicability, Besides, implicating in another political movement with the presence of external powers might have preceded many a peril which was not worth risking at all. By this reason, the entity of Imām's movement throughout his Imamate elucidated that his was never merely a political one though in many cases secession from politics exactly denoted a certain political activity.

And the ideological aspect of the adventure commenced when Mukhtār asked for Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya's assistance and advocacy. He consented but not officially. From then on, it was rumored that Ibn Ḥanafiyya's Imamate was accepted amongst the Iraqi Shi'ite Muslims. Although this notion was not corroborated, later when a sect named the Kīssanids was founded, the story began from the time of Mukhtār.

With the infiltration of the Exaggerators' theories into the Shi'ites nation in Kūfa, Mukhtār also was subject to accusation later. It was rumored that Mukhtār had played an influential role in emerging the Exaggerators. Based

---

[1]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p.126

on noncount justifications, referring to which does not seem convenient here and have been discussed elsewhere, all of these issues even that a sect named the Kīssanids believed in Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya's Imamate and Mahdavitism are open to doubt. Notwithstanding, regarding Imām Sadjdjād's position-taking against the Exaggerators there is evidence available. It was the predominant deviation among Iraqi Shi'ite Muslims which compelled Imām to refrain from taking a transparent stance and setting up a direct link with them.

Imām Sadjdjād (a) addressed a group of Iraqis saying, أحبونا حبّ الاسلام ولا ترفعونا فوق حدّنا[1] "Adore us for the sake of Islam but never promote us higher than we deserve."

Somewhere else, أحبونا حبّ الإسلام ولا تحبُّونا حبّ الأصنام[2] "Adore us for the sake of Islam but never idolatize us."

Abū Khālid Kābulī had recounted that he had heard Imām Sadjdjād (a) saying, إن قوما من شيعتنا سيُحبّونا حتى يقولوا فينا ما قالت اليهود في عزير وما قالت النصاري في عيسى بن مَريم، فلا هم منّا ولا نحن منهم[3] "Some of our Shi'ite Muslims go to extremes in adoring us to the extent that they repeat what the Jews and the Christians had declared about Ezra and Jesus Christ saying, "Neither are we from them nor are they from us"

In accordance with Shi'ites sources, Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya was on no accounts a misled one and had assented Imām Sadjdjād's Imāma. In order as a consequence to verify that Ibn Ḥanafiyya had indeed introduced himself as an Imām a few questions would be posed and solutions would be presumed that he had taken this action with the aid of Imām to keep Imām away although no historical proof supports such an assumption.

What merits to be borne in mind is that it beggars belief that Imām Sadjdjād (a) had uttered such words about Mukhtār, يكذب على الله وعلى رسوله[4] "He attributes false things to Allāh and the Prophet."

Especially, when Mukhtār had sent 'Ubayd Allāh's head to him, he had averred, جزى الله المختار خيرا[5] "May Allāh award Mukhtār the best!" Narratedly at that time, لم يبق من بني هاشم أحد الا قام بخطبة فيالثناء على المختار وجميل القول فيه[6] "There was no one from the Hāshimites who did not rise and admire Mukhtār." Quoted from Imām Bāqir was, لا تسبّوا المختار فأنه قتل قتلتنا وطلب ثأرنا وزوج أراملنا وقسم فينا المال على العسرة[7]

---

[1]. Ḥilyat al-awliyā', Vol.III, p.136

[2]. Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, Vol.XVII, p.242

[3]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p.102; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, Vol.V, p.214; Nasab Quraysh, Muṣ'ab Zubayrī, p.58

[4]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, Vol.V, p.213

[5]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p.127

[6]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, Vol.V, p.285

[7]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, Ibid. p.128

"Insult not Mukhtār for he has killed our assassins, has had our orphans marry and has allotted properties to us when in trouble."

And in an answer to the question of Mukhtār's son, he described his position about Mukhtār as positive.[1]

As discussed before, Mukhtār's movement did not politically last long and was suppressed by Ibn Zubayr followers in 67 AH. However, it had an impact on stimulating and perpetuating Shi'ites emotions in Kūfa and on motivating Mawālī to take part in political activities.

Due to the aforesaid deviation and even unlike Ibn Ḥanafiyya's possible wish, some were ambivalent whom to choose as an Imām. Qāsim Ibn 'Awf, one of Imām Sadjdjād's disciples, who had initially been hesitant whether to choose 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn or Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya ultimately joined Imām Sadjdjād as confessed by himeslf.[2] According to Kashshī, Abū Ḥamza Thumālī and Farāt Ibn Aḥnaf had been among his disciples.[3] Although Sa'īd Ibn Musayyib was controversial to be among them, he had apparently been ruling in accordance with the Sunnism. In Ridjāl, Kashshī has treated Sa'īd's position as disentanglement from Ḥadjdjādj.[4] His veneration for Imām, at all events, is without a shadow of a doubt and availing himself of Imām's presence scientifically and ethically is confirmed. But he did not attend Imām's funeral ceremony and as a result was objected to.[5]

Aside from these individuals, there had been a number deemed steadfast Shi'ite Muslims on the report of Shi'ites sources. At the starting-point there had been only few with Imām such as Sa'īd Ibn Djubayr, Sa'īd Ibn Musayyib, Muḥammad Ibn Djubayr Ibn Muṭ'im, Yaḥyā Ibn Umm al-Ṭawīl and Abū Khālid al-Kābulī.[6] The number of Imām Sadjdjād's disciples was said 173 by Shiykh al-Ṭā'ifa.[7]

Anyhow Imām could vastly contribute to Shi'ism eternity and its dissemination. His style in Islamic jurisprudence domain was narrating the Holy Prophet's hadiths through 'Alī (a). Only were these hadiths authentic

---

[1]. Ibid. p. 126

[2]. Ibid. p. 124

[3]. Ibid. p. 124

[4]. Ibid. p. 124

[5]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl. p. 116

[6]. Ibid. p. 115; In another narration, they are ntroduced three, ارتد الناس بعد قتل الحسين ثلاثة, يحيى بن ام الطويل، ابو خالد الكابلي، جبير بن مطعم، ثم ان الناس لحقوا وكثروا... "After Ḥusayn's murder all people apostatized but three, Yaḥyā Ibn Umm al-Ṭawīl, Abū Khālid al-Kābulī and Djubayr Ibn Muṭ'im. People joined them then..." see also Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p. 123

[7]. Ridjāl al-Ṭūsī, pp. 81-102

in Shi'ite Muslims' sight. By the same token, Shi'ites managed to take his first strides in Islamic jurisprudence averse to the existing deviations; nontheless, the main phase thereof procrastinated.

While calling for prayer (Adhān), Imām Sadjdjād inserted the sentence of, حيّ علي خيرالعمل "Hasten to practice good deeds."

When objections raised, he stated that Adhān had been that form since the inception.[1] Seceding from Iraqi deviations culminated in maintaining the doctrinal bases of Shi'ism against deviations. In spite of Imām's serious endeavor, which, of course, led to the perpetual Shi'ism, Medina could never ever be disposed to Shi'ites growth in the light of its deviations created from the Early Islamic Era as well as its incitement against Shites. Imām Sadjdjād himself had asserted that their vertical devotees both in Mecca and Medina had not exceeded twenty people.[2] Many lived in Iraq who were their enthusiasts, however.

IMĀM'S ENCOUNTER WITH THE UMAYYADS

Imām's ever-first encounter with the Umayya rulers after Karbalā event was with 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād. Ibn Ziyād asked his name.

Imām replied, "This is 'Alī".

"Did Allāh kill not 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn?" Ibn Ziyād asked surprisingly.

"I had a brother whom people killed", responded Imām.

"But Allāh did kill him", Ibn Ziyād added.

Imām Sadjdjād stated, .اللهُ يَتَوَفَّى الْأَنْفُسَ حِينَ مَوْتِهَا

Concluding to murder Imām, Ibn Ziyād was heroicly stopped by Zaynab (a).[3]

Yazīd also met him in Damascus[4] and reproached him. In an excellent sermon, Imām introduced himself and his family addressing the audience in the mosque. People who had for a long time been ignorantly influenced by the Umayya propagation and were not in the slightest acquainted with the Prophet's household became awakened somewhat by his sermon. Yazīd had to interrupt Imām, demagogically imputed the wickedness to Ibn Ziyād and respectfully saw off 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn along with other captives of Karbalā to

---

[1]. al-Muṣannaf, Ibn Abī Shayba, vol.I, p. 215 (published in India).

[2]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha of Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.IV, p. 104; Biḥār, vol. XXXXVI, p. 143; al-Ghārāt, p. 573

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 231 (published by 'Izz al-dīn); Nasab Quraysh of Muṣ'ab Zubayrī, p. 58

[4]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.V, p. 131

Medina. Among the noteworthy points in Imām's sermon was that he introduced his father, his family and himself as the Prophet's descendants whereas both Mu'āwiya and the Umayya have been constantly striving to inroduce them 'Alī's descendants not the Holy Prophet's.

A while after the event in Karbalā, revolting against the Umayya, the people of Medina organized the riot of Ḥarra, moreover. The leadership of the riot lay with 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥanẓala, Aliyas Ghasīl al-Malā'ika whose character was anti-Umayyads and anti-Yazīd and whose life style was non-Islamic. Imām Sadjdjād's as well as others' position from the Hāshimites was not positive; consequently, they abandoned the town with a number of their families. In Imām's view, the aforementioned movement had not merely a Shi'ites nature but was absolutely in line with Ibn Zubayr's intent, someone who had been among those occasioning the war of Djamal. Since Imām's any standing as a Shi'ites leader could precede the riskiest consequence for the Shi'ite Muslims, he did not involve himself.

Besides, when people had expelled the Umayyads, Imām's manliness entailed to give asylum to Marwān Ibn Ḥakam's wife at his request. Ṭabarī has written that Imām's old friendship with Marwān accounted for Imām's action.[1] It is in actual fact a barefaced lie. At that age and under those circumstances that his father and forefather had been in conflict with this reign, Imām's intimacy with Marwān as the most wretched element among the Umayyads was out of the question in a real sense of word. Marwān was the one who from the outset of securing allegiance in Medina had coerced the governor to either force Imām Ḥusayn to swear allegiance or take his life. Imām's reaction was a sportsmanlike answer to the Umayyads' foulness so that history could compare the conducts.

After Muslim Ibn 'Uqba, Aliyas Musraf suppressed the movement of Medina people and committed the greatest atrocities during the Umayya age, he acted moderately towards 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn due to his absence in the movement. Muslim secured allegiance from people in a way that they know themselves Yazīd's slaves; not withstanding, securing allegiance from 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn was quite normal.[2] Prior to Imām's entry, Muslim was cursing Imām and his forebear. But on Imām's arrival, he behaved calmly.

When Muslim was asked for his change subsequent to Imām's departure, he responded, ما كان ذلك لرأي منّي لقد ملىء قلبي منه رعبا[3] "My second conduct was not my wish. Fear had fully permeated into my heart."

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, Vol.V, p. 245; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.I, p. 208

[2]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha of Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.III, p. 259; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.V, p. 215; Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II, p. 107; Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, Vol.II, p. 25

[3]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, pp. 70, 71

Heedless of the fact that Imām's position-taking ought to be interpreted by considering the political state, military oppositions and the establishment of organizations, it had been the current situation which necessitated any Imām's responsibility[1] at any juncture. Every politically rational man is cognizant that the approaches adopted vary in various situations. As examined history evidences how Imām Sadjdjād(a) reserved and proliferated Shi'ism for the future activites.

As far as the relations between the 'Alawites and the Umayya were concerned, Imām was vehemently suspected by them and as Imām's slight movement could bare negative outcomes, he naturally believed that action-taking was not worth. One of the most significant religious-political principles by using which Imām spent his political life was Taqiyya (precautionary dissimulation). It shielded the Shi'ite Muslims' lives throughout history as pointed out by Imām over and over. Yet, in order to undermine the Shi'ite Muslims, a group, not in need of manipulating it, denied it strongly although it had been straightforwardly stipulated in Holy Qur'ān. The Sunnis on account of being in power required not Taqiyya and only for accusing the Shi'ite Muslims did they delete it from among the incontrovertible Islamic and Fiqhī commandments.

In a hadith, Imām Sadjdjād has stated that anyone not enjoining good and forbidding evil is like one who has set the divine Book aside and turned his back on it unless he follows Taqiyya. He was asked what Taqiyya was. He answered, يخاف جباراً عنيداً يخاف أن يفرط عليه أو أن يطغى[2] "To fear from a cruel ruler to kill him or oppress him."

Believing in Taqiyya as a Qur'ānic principle was in terms of Islamic jurisprudence accentuated more by Imāms who had to practice it. Imām Sadjdjād who lived an exceedingly difficult life had no other alternative but Taqiyya. It was fundamentally Taqiyya which safeguarded Shi'ism at that time, what of which Khāridjites, the extremists, did not avail themselves and as a result were struck hard. Narratedly, meeting Imām, someone asked him how he spent his life.

Imām responded, "We pass the time among our people as Israelites were among the Pharaoh's people. They kill our children and take our women as bondwomen. People get nearer to our foes by insulting our lord. If Quraysh prides itself on having Muḥammad before other Arabs and if Arabs consider themselves superior to non-Arabs for having Muḥammad (s) and they have approved such a virtue for Arabs and Quraysh, we, Ahl al-Bayt, should be proud of ourselves before Quraysh because Muḥammad has been from

---

[1]. The unseen knowledge is consistent with the duty mentioned not separated from it.

[2]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.V, p. 214; Ḥilyat al-awliyā', vol.III, p. 140

among us. Yet, they usurped our rights and this is the way our time goes by".

The narrator added that Imām was speaking in a way that only those nearby be able to hear him.

Overall, Imām's lenience with the Umayya provided a free life in Medina for Imām and less was he center of attention on the part of the opponents. Furthermore it manifested Imām's scientific dimention in reserving the religion. The great admiration made by a Sunnites scholar about him is a proof. Were Imām involved in politics, no one could describe this aspect of Imām's character.

IMĀM SADJDJĀD'S PROFITING FROM DU'Ā (PRAYER)

When the community was deviated, the spirit of comfort-loving and worldliness prevailed, it was confined by political, ethical and social corruption and when there was no opening to breathe politically, Imām Sadjdjād could partially express his beliefs throgh prayer and reactivate the nation to pay heed to insight and worship. Although, seemingly, the main aim within the prayers had been insight and worship, in regard with the phrases it can be claimed that people could have perceived the political concepts between the lines.

Al-Ṣaḥīfa al-Sadjdjādiyya including more than fifty prayers is only a part of Imām Sadjdjād's compiled prayers. The number of the collections inclusive of his prayers is six with the above mentioned one. The prayers inside some of them exceed 180.[1] These prayers had been used by the Sunnis in addition to the Shi'ite Muslims,[2] so it can be inferred how influential they had been at that time. Among all Shi'ites Imāms, Imām Sadjdjād (a) is more famous for his prayers.

Within the prayers there is a phrase repeatedly used and rarely can a prayer be found excluding it. It is, صلوات بر محمد وآل محمد "Peace be to Muḥammad and his progeny."

Basically it is an indication of genuine prayers. Once naming a baby 'Alī was decried and the Umayya could execute nothing without insulting 'Alī (a),[3] observing such a phrase appeared virtuous.

---

[1]. al-Dharī'a, vol.XV, pp. 18-21

[2]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha of Ibn Abi l-Ḥadid, vol.XI, p. 192; vol.VI, pp. 178-186; vol.V, p. 113

[3]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha of Ibn Abi l-Ḥadid, vol.XIII, p. 220; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.I, p. 184

Such phrases as, محمد وآله الطيبين الطاهرين الاخيار الانجبين[1] "Muḥammad and his decent, clean, chosen and honored descendants."

Imām's insistence on uniting Muḥammad and his descendants was what Allāh had emphasized and it is of utmost importance for expressing Shi'ites beliefs. Previous to narrating contents of some of his prayers it looks proper to refer to a hadith on consolidating the link between Muḥammad and his Household.

Imām Sadjdjād has stated, "It is incumbent upon a learned to say Ṣalawāt to Allāh's Prophet. Allāh has joined us to him as well. If anyone say Ṣalawāt for the Prophet but excludes us, not only does he make it imperfect but also he disobeys Allāh.[2]" The union of Muḥammad and his Household can substantially affect people's stance on the Holy Prophet's household.

The issue of Imamate is one of the central religious-political contents of al-Ṣaḥīfa. The concept of Imāma as a Shi'ites concept depicts the divine aspects of infallibility along with profiting from the prophets' body of knowledge in general and that of the holy Prophet in particular in addition to its superiority over caliphate and leadership.

We show some examples, ربّ صلّ على أطائب اهل بيته الذين اخترتهم لأمرك وجعلتم خزنة علمك وحفظة دينك وخلفائك في أرضك وحججك على عبادك وطهرّتهم من الرجس والدّنس تطهيراً بارادتك وجعلتهم الوسيلة اليك والمسلك الى جنّتك[3] "O Lord! Bless those pure from Muḥammad's progeny, those whom Thou have chosen for ruling and those whom Thou have designated as Thy depositaries of science and guards of Thy religion. Thou created tem as Thy caliphs and proof for Thy servants on the earth. Thou not only cleansed them from any impurity of Thy own volition, but also determined them as a vehicle for reaching Thee and the abiding Heaven."

اللّهم انّ هذا المقام لخلفائك وأصفيائك وموضع أمنائك في الدّرجة الّتي اختصصتهم بها قد ابتزوها... حتى عاد صفوتك وخلفائك مغلوبين، مقهورين مبتزّين ... أللهم العن أعدائهم من الاوّلين والاخرين ومن رضي بفعالهم وأشياعهم وأتباعهم[4]

"O Allāh! Caliphate does solely belong to Thy caliphs, the chosen from creatures. The position Thou had assigned for Thy Trustee in sublime ranks was usurped by others... until Thy caliphs and chosen ones were vanquished by the oppressors and their rights were disregarded. O my Lord! Thy malediction be upon their enemies from the beginning to the end, upon those gratified with this oppression and upon their followers."

---

[1]. al-ṣaḥīfat al-Sadjdjādiyya, prayer 6, item 24

[2]. Tārikh Djurdjān, p. 188

[3]. Tārikh Djurdjān, prayer 47, item 56

[4]. Ibid. prayer 48, items 9-10

وصلّ على خيرتك اللّهم من خلقك محمّد وعترته الصّفوةَ من بريّتك الطّاهرين واجعلنا لهم سامعين ومطيعين كما أمرت اللهّم اجعلنى من أهل التّوحيد والايمان بك والتّصديق برسولک والائمة الّذين حتمت طاعتهم.[1]

"O Lord! Bless the best creature of all, Muḥammad, and his chosen kinfolks. Make us obedient to them as Thou have commanded. O Lord! Make me one of the believers of the Prophet and Imāms, those whose obedience Thou have ordered."

اللّهم انّك ايّدت دينك في كلّ أوان بامام أقمته علماً لعبادك ومناراً في بلادك بعد ان وصلت حبله بحبلك وجعلته الذّريعة الي رضوانك وافترضت طاعته وحذرت معصيته وأمرت بامتثال أوامره والانتهاء الي نهيه وأن لا يتقدّمه متقدّم ولا يتأخّر عنه متأخّر فهو عصمة للائذين وكهف المؤمنين وعروة المتمسكين وبهاء العالمين .... [2] وأقم به كتابك وحدودك وشرائعك وسنن رسولك صلواتك اللّه عليه واله وأحي به ما أماته الظّالمون من معالم دينك وأجل به صداء الجور عن طريقتك وابن به الضّراء من سبيلك وأزل به النّاكبين عن صراطك وأمحق به بغاة قصدك عوجاً ... واجعلنا له سامعين مطيعين.[3]

"O Lord! At any time Thou have appointed an Imām as a flag and a guidance lamp for Thy servants on the earth. Through establishing a direct link between Thyself and him, choosing him a way far drawing Thy gratification, enjoining all to obey his commands and prohibiting all from disobeying him, Thou did approve Thy religion. He is an Imām over whom no one has priority and from whom no one has the right to separate. An Imām for whom Thou have arranged a secure place for approaching Thee is he. Thou have bestowed firm faith on him who resorts Thy leading and favor and bestowed a highest honor in the world as he is a refuge for the believers... O Lord! Safeguard Thy book, Islamic limits, religious laws and Thy Prophet's Sunna by him, revive any of Thy religious tenets which the oppressor dissolved by him and obliterate any corruption or deviation in Thy straight path by him. Obviate the dangers in Thy way by him, make us obedient to him and successful in satisfying him."

It can be evidently inferred from the sentences above that Imām's determination had been disseminating Shi'ites beliefs through the concept of Imāma as the most crucial in Shi'ism. Similar contents admiring Ahl al-Bayt from Nahdj al-Balāgha had been presented in the discussion about Imām 'Alī's caliphate.

As referred to the domain of the prayers is incredredibly vast and contains other aims such as devotional, intellectual and political. Brining an intellectual example would be appropriate here. Irbilī recounted that while Imām Sadjdjād was in the Prophet's mosque in Medina he noticed that a group having a doctrinal discussion likened Allāh to his creature. Imām who

---

[1]. Tārīkh Djurdjān. prayer 34

[2]. Ibid. prayer 47

[3]. loc.cit.

was incensed, stood up, went to the Prophet's grave and began praying from which the content of negating comparison could be deduced. Shedding tears he was praying,

الهي قد بدت قدرتك ولم تبد هيئتك فجهلوك وقدّروك بالتقدير على غير ما انت به فشبّهوك وأنا بريء يا الهي من الذّين بالتّشبيه طلبوك ...[1]

"O my Allāh! Thy might is revealed. They do not appreciate Thee. They ordain despite what Thou have foreordained. They compare Thee with mankind while I loathe it. O my Allāh! Who are those who seek Thee with comparison?"

One of the Imām's actions at different times was to make people acquainted with the Prophet's Household about whom all the rights and virtues were specified in Qur'ān and Sunna. In Damascus the Umayya introduced themselves the Holy Prophet's Household as in Hidjāz some of the Prophet's wives did so. Since his wives died one after another and left no child, the existence of Ahl al-Bayt was rendered null and void. And now no one but Fāṭima's offspring was remained. Making them known was requisite especially in as much as the incidents after the Prophet's departure had had them keep silent in political scenes. Imām Sadjdjād introduced the household when he was taken to Damascus and it was in his famous sermon as confirmed by a number of historical records.

In this regard, we present a narration.

و أتيَ بحرم رسول اللّه صلى الله عليه وآله حتي دخلوا مدينة دمشق من باب يقال له «توماء»، ثم أتيَ بهم حتى وقفوا علي درج باب المسجد حيث يقام السبي واذا الشيخ قد أقبل حتى دنا منهم وقال, الحمد لله الذي قتلكم وأهلككم وأراح الرجال من سطوتكم وأمكن أميرالمؤمنين منكم. فقال له علي بن الحسين, يا شيخ! هل قرأت القرآن؟ قال: نعم قد قرأته، قال: فعرفت هذه الاية: قل لاأسئلكم اجراً الا المودّة في القربى؟ قال الشيخ: نعم. فقال علي بن الحسين: فنحن القربى يا شيخ، قال: هل قرأت في سورة بني اسرائيل: وآت ذا القربي حقه؟ قال الشيخ: قد قرأت ذلك، فقال علي: نحن القربى يا شيخ. وهل قرأت هذه الاية «واعلموا أنما غنمتم من شيء فان لله خمسه وللرسول ولذي القربى، قال الشيخ: قد قرأت ذلك، فقال علي: فنحن ذو القربى يا شيخ. ولكن هل قرأت هذه الايه: انما يريد الله ليذهب عنكم الرجس أهل البيت ويطهركم تطهيراً، قال الشيخ: قد قرأت ذلك. قال علي: فنحن اهل البيت الذي خصنا بآية الطهارة. فبقي الشيخ ساعة ساكتاً نادماً علي ما تكلّمه؛ ثم رفع رأسه الي السماء وقال: اللهم اني تائب اليك في ما تكلمته ومن بعض هولاء القوم، اللهم اني أبرء اليك من عدّو محمد وآل محمد.[2]

The Prophet's Household were brought. They were entered Damascus through a door called "Tūmā'" They stood by the mosque door with other captives.

An old man approached them and said, "I offer my appreciation to Allāh who killed you and let people relieve and Amīr al-Mu'minīn Yazīd overcame you".

---

[1]. Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II, p. 89

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.V, pp. 242-243

'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn asked him, "Man, have you ever recited Qur'ān?" "Sure, I have" the old man answered.

"Have you ever seen the verse of Say, I do not ask of you any reward for it (my mission) but love for my near relatives", Imām asked.

"Yes, I have", said he.

'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn added, "Those near relatives are we, man". Imām asked again. "How about the verse in Banī-Isrā'īl Sūra "Give the rights of the relatives?"

"Yes", he answered.

"We are those relatives", stated Imām. "Have you ever read the verse of 'And know that whatever thing you gain, a fifth of it is for Allāh and for the Apostle and for the near of the kin' ", asked 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn.

The man answered, "Yes".

"How about this verse, man? Allāh only desires to keep away the uncleanness from you, O people of the House! And to purify you a (thorough) purifying", asked Imām.

"Yes, I have read it", he said.

"These people of the house are we". 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn added.

The man ashamed of whatever he had produced kept silent for a while. Then he rose his head up to the sky and said, "O My Allāh! I repent of what I have said and of the grudge I have born them. I loathe the enemies of Muḥammad and his progeny".

Imām Sadjdjād's lamentation as well as his real worship within the frame of these prayers was an instructive lesson for the present corrupted community wherein Islam was disdained by the Umayya. His lamentation was also for the harrowing event of Karbalā.

Imām had stated, "Although doubtful about his death, Jacob wept for Joseph so hard that his eyes turned blind. How can I not help weeping while sixteen people from the Prophet's Household were martyred in front of my very eyes."[1] His lamentation did automatically make people conscious of the event in Karbalā though he himself recounted the details of the event, moreover.[2]

IMĀM SADJDJĀD AND SLAVES

One of Imām's activities, both religious and political, was his heed to a class who had been under socially vehement pressure from the caliph II's

---

[1]. Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol.XVII, p. 239

[2]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, pp. 196, 212, (published by 'Izz al-dīn)

tenure onward particularly during the Umayyads' term and had been the most underprivileged group in the Islamic community in early centuries. The bondsmen and bondswomen whether Iranian, Roman, Egyptian or Sudanese suffering the most laborious tasks were humiliated by their masters.

Like Amīr al-Mu'minīn (a), Imām Sadjdjād (a) absorbed a number of Iraqi Mawālī (freed slaves) through his Islamic conduct and attempted to upgrade the social reputation of this class. Once Imām freed a bondswoman and married her, in order to censure her, 'Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwān reproached him for this marriage, Imām refereed to the verse of,

لَقَدْ كَانَ لَكُمْ فِي رَسُولِ اللّٰهِ أُسْوَةٌ حَسَنَةٌ.

"Allāh's Messenger is a good model for you."

Concerning the Prophet's approach about Ṣafiyya. He also pointed out the marriage of the Prophet's cousin with Zayd Ibn Ḥāritha.[1] Accordingly, he breathed new life into Prophet's dead tradition afresh.

Sayyid al-Ahl has written that although Imām never needed slaves, he purchased them regularly only for the purpose of their releasing. Reportedly, some one hundred thousand slaves were freed by Imām. Discerning Imām's intention, the slaves exposed themselves to him to be purchased. Since Imām Sadjdjād had been purchasing them day in and day out, a large group was formed in Medina like an army including male and female slaves being all Imām's Mawālī.[2]

Narrated by 'Allama Amīnī, at the end of each fasting month of Ramaḍān, Imām Sadjdjād freed twenty slaves. He has added that never did he keep a slave more than a year and even after setting free he granted some properties to them.[3] During that period they personally got well acquainted with Imām Sadjdjād's extensive knowledge, ethics and piety and their affection for him was as a consequence natural. Some time a bondwoman with a bowl of water was pouring water on Imām's hands. All of a sudden it dropped down, knocked Imām on the face and injured him. As soon as Imām took a look at her, she said, والكاظمين الغيظ "Those restraining their anger." Imām said, "I restrained my anger". والعافين عن الناس "Those forgiving people." ,added she. "I forgave you", Imām stated. واللّٰه يحب المحسنين[4] "Allāh loves the benevolent," she recited. Imām said, "For Allāh's sake, I released you".[5]

---

[1]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.V, p. 24; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.V, p. 140

[2]. Zayn al-Ābidīn, Sayyid al-Ahl, pp. 7, 47

[3]. A'yān al-shī'a, vol.IV, p. 468 (First Edition)

[4]. Āl Imrān, 134

[5]. Sharḥ al-akhbār, vol.III, p. 260

On stepping out of the mosque, Imām Sadjdjād (a) was insulted by someone. When Imām's Mawālī invaded him, Imām hindered them and stated, "What has remained unrevealed about us is more than what he expresses". The man became ashamed after all and was pardoned by Imām generously.[1]

Now once again Imām's magnanimity is mentioned. It is worth recounting a story.

'Abd Allāh Ibn Muḥammad Ibn 'Umar had narrated, "Hishām Ibn Ismā'īl, an Umayya governor in Medina had ignored the neighbors' rights and had begun annoying us specifically 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn. When he was deposed, Walīd commanded to expose him to the public so that any one willing could take revenge on him. Hishām confessed that he scared no one that much but 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn. While being hung from the Marwān bulwark, he requested his friends not to utter an insulting word when Imām Sadjdjād passed by. As soon as noticing Imām going, Hishām yelled out, الله اعلم حيث يجعل رسالته[2] "Allāh truly knows with whom to lay His mission."

THE HĀSHIMITES AFTER THE EVENT OF KARBALĀ'

Aside from Imām Sadjdjād there existed two 'Abbāsids and 'Alawites figures who cooperated in political and collective activities. One was Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya, 'Alī's son, and the other was 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib whose fame was thanks to the narrations quoted from the Prophet notably dealing with interpretation.[3] Not Fāṭima's son however, he was deemed high-ranking by the Shi'ite Muslims due to his elderliness among the other 'Alawites as the leader of political Shi'ite Muslims, propounding Ahl al-Bayt's leadership politically. Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya had been eminent and focus of Imām 'Alī's attention in the course of wars at that Imām's term. The flag of Imām's army in the war of Djamal was held aloft by Ibn Ḥanafiyya.[4] His own analysis was that both Imām Ḥasan and Imām Ḥusayn were Imām 'Alī's eyes and he was his hand and it was hand which ought to protect the eyes.[5]

---

[1]. Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II, p. 101; al-Iṭḥāf, pp. 137, 138; Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimashq, vol. XVII, p. 243

[2]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.VI, p. 526; Sharḥ al-akhbār, vol.III, p. 260

[3]. Ḥudidjatī, Muḥammad Bāqir, Si Maqālih dar tārikh tafsīr wa naḥw. (three papers n history of Interpretation and Syntax), from p. 27 on (Tehran, 1360)

[4]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.I, p. 243

[5]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XI, p. 28. He had been one of the bravest in the Hāshimites; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha of Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XV, p. 285

Indicating the positions of these three brothers, Imām ʻAlī had state, أين النجم من الشمس والقمر[1] "Where is the star of the sun and the moon."

Imām enlightened them why the flag was given to Ibn Ḥanafiyya. It had been for the protection of the Prophet's descendants.[2] That he had not been from the Fāṭimids was an excuse for Ibn Zubayr to humiliate him later[3] although never did it affect the Shi'ite Muslims.

No one doubts that he had been one of the most steadfast Shi'ite Muslims as his actions had verified the fact; nevertheless, no evidence could ever be located from the historical sources about his claim for leadership, though others might take advantage of him, even found a sect and believe his Mahdavitism. Many individuals including a few Shi'ites Imāms had had the same affliction too. Ibn Ḥanafiyya was the narrator of the hadiths which could lead people more towards the Holy Prophet's Household.

He has been quoted as saying, من أحبنا لله نفعه الله بحبنا ولو كان اسيراً بالدّيلم[4] "Any one who loves us, he will be benefited by Allāh even if he is imprisoned in Diylam."

The devotees of the Household were many whereas the loyal to the verse of, قُلْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تُحِبُّونَ اللّٰهَ فَاتَّبِعُونِي. "Say, If you love Allāh, then follow me" were few.

Owing to this fact Imām Sadjdjād had stated, ما بمكة والمدينة عشرون رجلا يحبنا[5] "Our Faithful Shi'ite Muslims do not exceed twenty both in Mecca and Medina."

The number of the political enthusiasts was great, however.

When addressing him, Ibn Ḥanafiyya's followers usually said, يابن خيرالاخيار وابن ابرّ الابرار ما خلا النبيين والمرسلين[6] "O son of the best of the best, son of the benevolent of the benevolent after the prophets and the Apostles."

More threatening of Ibn Zubayr's two adversaries namely, Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya and Mukhtār was Ibn Ḥanafiyya. The whys and the wherefores were one, Mukhtār had risen up in Kūfa under his banner and the other was that the leadership of some part f Shi'ites movement apparently had been undertaken by him. Ibn Zubayr who had determinedly bent his efforts to smear their reputation banned reciting blessing to the Holy Prophet (s) for 40 weeks.

---

1. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, p. 245
2. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.IX, p. 111
3. Ibid. vol.IV, p. 63
4. Ibid. vol.IV, p. 105
5. Ibid. vol.IV, p. 105
6. al-Futūḥ, vol.VI, pp. 239, 240.

Being asked for its reason, he said, ان له أهيل سوء فان ذكر مدّوا أعناقهم لذكره[1] "His family is small. Whenever he is commemorated, all members of this family will say we are in this family."

He had made more offensive remarks in this respect as well[2] like, بيت سوء لا أول لهم ولا أخر "The sinister house for which there is neither beginning nor end."

It aroused Ibn 'Abbās's anger acutely banished by Ibn Zubayr to Ṭā'if.[3] Ibn Zubayr himself had made a confession that it had been 40 years he bore this family a grudge.[4] He was the one who incited his father to betray Ahl al-Bayt and stand against Imām 'Alī (a) in Djamal.

Concerning him Imām 'Alī had stated, ما زال الزبير منا اهل البيت حتي نشأ ابنه المشؤوم عبد الله[5] "Zubayr always belonged to us, Ahl al-Bayt until his inauspicious son, 'Abd Allāh, emerged."

As narrated by Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, the only stimulater of 'Āyisha had also been 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr according to Ibn 'Umar.[6] It was not unreasonable why she felt affection for him after his father and the Prophet.[7]

These was a testimony that how great was the grudge Ibn Zubayr bore the 'Alawites, Although his archenemy was the Umayyads, neverever did he leave the Hāshimites relieved. Since the Hāshimites naturally swore no allegiance to him, he emancipated Ibn Ḥanafiyya, Ibn 'Abbās together with 24 people from among the Hāshimites in the entrance to the well of Zamzam. Mukhtār's envoys succeeded to release them in an ambush attack with their bare hands.[8] Ibn Zubayr's determination had been to burn them to death. When 'Urwa Ibn Zubayr, famous for narrating the Prophet's hadiths, was objected in this regard, he reacted as saying that it had been done for the purpose of maintaining Muslim solidarity and it had been what the caliph II had adopted against those who opposed to swearing allegiance to Abū Bakr.

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p. 29.

[2]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.IV, p. 62; pp. 127, 129; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.V, p. 161.

[3]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XX, p. 128.

[4]. Ibid, vol.IV, p. 62; vol. XX, p. 148.

[5]. Ibid, vol.XX, p. 102

[6]. Ibid, vol. XX, p. 107

[7]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol. XX, p. 110

[8]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 261; They were 17 in another narration; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XX, pp. 123, 124

Even he had accumulated logs to set fire to their houses.[1] Nevertheless, Ibn Zubayr had not the audacity to do so in view of the fact that a majority of his followers had turned to him merely due to the Umayyads oppression and as a matter of fact they would rather be with a corrupt man than be with a more corrupt one and on no accounts would they allow him.[2]

Time after time in his sermons, Ibn Zubayr cavilled Imām 'Alī (a) and made Ibn Ḥanafiyya raise an objection. Consequently, verbal dispute flared up between them.[3] It resulted in Ibn Ḥanafiyya's expulsion which was followed by Ibn 'Abbās's protest.[4] Seeking advantage by exploiting this dispute, 'Abd al-Malik wrote to Ibn Ḥanafiyya inviting him to Damascus. Ibn 'Abbās admiring Ibn Ḥanafiyya's character requested 'Abd al-Malik to make allowances for him. He accepted his demand, hence Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya betook himself to Damascus. Anyone who passed by him on the way talked about his uprising. His features had become proverbial. 'Abd al-Malik who predicted his menace informed Ibn Ḥanafiyya while en route that he should swear allegiance to him if coming to Damascus. Declining his proposal, he switched his way to Mecca again and resided in Abū Ṭālib mountain-pass with a group of his Kūfiyān friends. The conflicts between him and Ibn Zubayr reignited and sparked off his expulsion to Ṭā'if. Meanwhile Ibn 'Abbās was expelled from Mecca to Ṭā'if too; therefore, both began propagating against Ibn Zubayr together. It was where Ibn 'Abbās passed away in 68 and Ibn Ḥanafiyya said prayer for him.[5]

The final phases of Ibn Ḥanafiyya's life remained vague. Some people known as followers of the Kissānīds claimed that he had been alive and living on Raḍwā mount. In accordance with Ibn A'tham, he left Ṭā'if with 40 Shi'ite Muslims to Raḍwā mount and disappeared without trace.[6] His going to Raḍwā mount was mentioned by Ya'qūbī as well.[7] From Sayyid Ḥimyarī's poems, once a believer of the Kīssanids, a belief in Ibn Ḥanafiyya's Mahdavitism and his disappearance from sight can be inferred.

---

[1]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha of Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol. XX, p. 147; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 86

[2]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XX, p. 128

[3]. Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 262

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.VI, p. 252

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.VI, pp. 240-253

[6]. Ibid, vol.VI, p. 253

[7]. Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 262

Alluding to the Prophet's hadith on Mahdavitism, "His name is like that of mine and his nickname also resembles that of mine", he had composed,

يفوز بكنيتي واسمي لاني نحلتمـــاه والمهدي من بعدي
يغيّب عنهم حتى يقولوا تضمنه بطيبة بطـــن لحـــــد
سنين وأشهر برضوى بشعب بيـــن أغمـــار وأسد[1]

"He will be in a grace that I have bestowed him with my name and nickname. He will be the leader after me. He will disappear while people say he has gone to his last resting-place. For years and months he will be invisible in the valley among the lions and leopards and on Raḍwā mount."

The lines below belong to Kuthayyir 'Azza about Kissānīds tenets,

ألا ان الائمة مـــن قريش ولاة الحق أربعـــة ســـواء
علي والثلاثه مـــن بنيـــه هم الاسباط ليس بهم خفاء
فسبط، سبط ايمـــان وبر وسبط غيّبتـــه كربـــلاء
وسبط لا يذوق الموت حتى يقود الخيل يقدمه اللـــواء
تغيب لا يري فيهم زمانـــا برضوي عنده عسل وماء[2]

"Be informed that Imāms from Quraysh and the owners of rights are four, 'Alī and his three sons. These are his sons not anyone else. A son of his was the example of faith and goodness while his another son was removed in Karbalā. The other one who has not yet tasted death in order to lead cavalrymen having a standard at the front is disappeared from view on Raḍwā mount with honey and water."

Some considered Mukhtār as the founder of the Kīssanids which might have been named after one of Imām 'Alī's slaves called Kissānīds.[3] Other reasons have been presented for its denomination in various books related to different sects and religions. No scientific research has ever been done yet, but some are of this belief that the Kīssanids have been wholly fabricated by narrators.[4]

---

[1]. al-Aghānī, vol.VII, p. 234, It is reported that later Sayyid Ḥimyarī changed his beliefs and became Imām Ṣādiq's disciple and composed,

تجعفرت باسم الله والله اكبر وأيقنت بالله يعفو ويغفر

"In the name of Allāh, the Great, I became Dja'far's follower while certain of Allāh's forgiveness" Although some expressed doubt about his conversion from the Kīssānids, al-Aghānī, vol.VII, pp. 231, 235, 241-242

[2]. al-Milal wa l-niḥal, vol.I, pp. 133, 134; Sharḥ al-akhbār, vol.III. P. 297

[3]. al-Milal wa l-niḥal, vol.I, p. 131.

[4]. Madhāhib Ibtada'athā al-siyāsia fi l-tārīkh, 'Abd al-wāḥid al-Anṣārī, published in Beirut 1973; Qāmūs al-riḍjāl, p. 452

As a number believed that Ibn Ḥanafiyya had shared in foundation of such a sect, the 'Abbāsids tried from the outset to secure power through 'Alī's succession, thus they declared a proportion for Ibn Ḥanafiyya. In order to justify their caliphate, they announced that the Prophet's authority transferred to 'Alī then to Imām Ḥasan and Ḥusayn and entrusted to Ibn Ḥanafiyya by Imām Ḥusayn (a). After being transferred to Ibn Ḥanafiyya's son, Abū Hāshim, it was devolved to Muḥammad Ibn 'Alī Ibn 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās subsequent to Abū Hāshim's death.[1]

Connecting these two issues reveals that the Kīssanids sect had been beneficial to the 'Abbāsids so that it could transfer the caliphate this way to their lineage. Later on, that way went disadvantageous to the 'Abbāsids. Accordingly, they decided to legitimize their caliphate with recourse to 'Abbās and proving his inheritance from the Prophet.[2]

'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās, another distinguished member of the Hāshimites, was among Ibn Zubayr's unyielding opponents in Mecca. Yazīd, when alive, had held him in high esteem for his opposition against Ibn Zubayr owing to the fact that he had imagined he could use this opportunity in favor of himself.

In response to his letter, touching upon Imām Ḥusayn's and 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib's offspring's murders, Ibn 'Abbās reproved him as saying, لا أبالك ! أنسيت قتلك الحسين وفتيان عبدالمطلب، مصابيح الدجي الذين غادرهم جنودك مصرعين في صعيد واحد مرملين بالدماء مسلوبين بالعراء غيرمكفنين ... "O fatherless! Have I forgotten Husyan's murder and 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib's youths who were lights in darkness, those whom your troops left while shrouded in their blood and stripped off they had been fallen on the ground?"

And about his father he added, وقد أمات ابوك السنّة جهلاً وأحيا البدع والاحداث المضلّة عمداً[3] "Your father did ignorantly dissolve the Prophet's Sunna and did expressly revive the misleading heresies."

Yazīd in his answer accused Ibn 'Abbās of being an accomplice of 'Uthmān's assassins. In return, Ibn 'Abbās said that the main culprit had been his father, Mu'āwiya, because he had delayed his assistance until 'Uthmān was dead.[4]

Like Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya[5], in Ibn 'Abbās's opinion caliphate had been changed terribly from Prophethood and caliphate into monarchism. He

---

[1]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha of Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.VII, pp. 149, 150

[2]. al-Ḥayāt al-siyāsiyya li l-Imām al-Riḍā, from p. 37 on

[3]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, pp. 248, 250; the letter is fully in al-Ma'rifat wa l-tārīkh, by Fasawī, vol.I, pp. 531-533

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p. 18

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.VI, p. 238

advised people to keep as far away from both Ibn Zubayr and the Umayyads as possible, for they both drive them toward Hell.[1]

Quite compatible was the position adopted by Ibn 'Abbās about the events in Mecca during Ibn Zubayr's time with that of Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya. Ibn 'Abbās mainly backed Ibn Ḥanafiyya and every now and then they both got into argument with Ibn Zubayr over diverse issues.[2] One of their most considerable arguments was when Ibn Zubayr set Ibn 'Abbās against the people abiding by caliph II in the issue of "temporary marriage ban" by accusing him on the pulpit of believing in "temporary marriage". Ibn 'Abbās stood up all at once and declared that his belief in temporary marriage was based on what the Holy Prophet had prescribed and if he (Ibn Zubayr) had doubted, he could have asked his mother.[3]

Ibn 'Abbās's oposition culminated in his expulsion from Mecca. Banished to Ṭā'if, under no circumstances did he relinquish his struggle.

About Ibn Zubayr he told people, بقي أقوام يطلبون الدنيا بعمل الاخرة ويلبسون جلود الضأن تحتها قلوب الذئاب ... ليظن الناس أنهم من الزاهدين "Those who are remained are seeking worldly life and are wolves in sheep's clothing to pretend they are ascetic people."

It caused Ibn Zubayr to write to him taking him to task. Notwithstanding, Ibn 'Abbās, an eminent figure, never abstained from answering him reproachfully.[4]

Ibn Ḥanafiyya said prayer for 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās who passed away in 68 in Ṭā'if and announced, اليوم مات رباني هذه الامة رحمه الله تعالى "Today a divine person from among this nation died. May Allāh bless him."

Up to that time and even after a long while, there was no strife amongst the Hāshimites. As observed afterwards, conflict between the 'Abbāsids and the Ṭālibites triggered off and developed so gradually that the Ṭālibites were deemed the 'Abbāsids' archenemies at Manṣūr's time and were under their heaviest pressure.

Whatsoever had been narrated regarding the Hāshimites after 'Abd al-Malik's sovereignty shows that he had adopted the policy of condescension and had written to Ḥadjdjādj to avoid streaming the blood of 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib's descendants. Since Abū Sufyān's family had lost their power this

---

[1].Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p. 196

[2]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha of Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol. XX, pp. 134, 148

[3]. See al-Ziwādj al-muwaqqat fi l-islām "Al-Mut'a", pp. 99, 103 by Kitāb Muslim, vol.IV, p. 133; Naṣb al-rāya, vol.III, p. 180; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol. XX, p. 130

[4]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XX, pp. 125, 126

way.[1] In the meantime, until Zayd Ibn 'Alī's uprising in 122 there had been no openly political activity on the part of the Hāshimites except what had been said vaguely about the 'Abbāssid's.

[1]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.V, p. 149

CHAPTER X
THE MARWĀNIDS' GOVERNMENT

ĀL MARWĀN'S RULE

Yazīd's demise (in Ṣafar 64) was the origin of instability in the Sufyānids's sovereignty. Such instability could be felt not only in the lands distant from the capital but also inside Damascus, the center of the Umayyads's caliphate. The instability was expanded when Mu'āwiya II after forty days or four months abdicated. He announced, الا وان جدّي معاوية بن ابي سفيان نازع الامر من كان أولى به منه في القرابة برسول الله وأحق في الاسلام، سابق المسلمين، اول المؤمنين وابن عم رسول رب العالمين وأبا بقيّة خاتم المرسلين "My forefather, Mu'āwiya did battle with the one who was the closest to the Prophet in kinship and had long record in Islam. The ever-first Muslim, the ever-first believer, the Prophet's cousin and the father of the Seal of the Prophet's Household was no one save he."

Enumerating some of his father's and forefather's negative conducts, he added, "They martyred the Prophet's kinfolks, profaned the sacred sanctuary and set fire on Ka'ba. Neverever will I undertake your responsibility."[1]

Marwān Ibn Ḥakam suggested that he organize a council like 'Umar. He recoiled from the responsibility, however.[2]

It was astonishing that he was Yazīd's son especially when he described his brother,'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Yazīd as, كان ناسكاً متألّها[3] "He is a divine man and a worshipper."

The principal threat to the Umayyads was in the oriental Islamic lands. It was due to the emergence of a rather powerful substitute from 61 A.H. in Mecca who bid his time to take advantage of the existing instability and dethrone the Umayyads in that area. After Yazīd's death, 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād, the governor, tried to keep still Baṣra and Kūfa under his power but the riot of Baṣra people had him escape to Damascus.[4] From then on after

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 254

[2]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 254

[3].Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p. 72

[4]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 85; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol. IV, p. 387

Mukhtār until 72 A.H., Iraq was ruled by Ibn Zubayr and the Umayyads contented themselves with only Damascus and Egypt.

With the prevailing instability in Damascus, some allied themselves with Ibn Zubayr to eradicate the Umayyads. Nu'mān Ibn Bashīr Anṣārī governing Ḥimṣ turned to Ibn Zubayr. Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Qays, one of the most influential Umayyads commanders, took control of Damascus. In Palestine, Nātil Ibn Qays Djudhāmī joined Ibn Zubayr. 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Djaḥdam Fihrī as Ibn Zubayr's agent began his activities in Egypt. The one and the only land remained for the Umayyads was Jordan ruled by Ḥassān Ibn Buḥdal Kalbī.[1] And about the tribes, the Qaysids were on Ibn Zubayr's side and the Kalbids on 'Amr Ibn Sa'īd's and Marwān Ibn Ḥakam Ibn Abi l-'Ās's side.[2] The Qaysids included the tribes of Sulaym, Hawāzin and Ghaṭfān whereas the tribes backing Marwān were Kalb, Ghassan, Sakūn, Saksak, Tanūkh, Ṭayy (from Damascus) and Qayn.[3] The conflict between these two wings occurred in 64. Marwān Ibn Ḥakam as a leader from Quraysh and the Umayyads secured allegiance from his followers as a caliph and together with the followers of 'Amr Ibn Sa'īd went to a war with Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Qays. The violent battle done in Mardj Rāhiṭ led to the Qaysids' defeat and Ḍaḥḥāk's murder, on one hand, and to Marwān's penetration into Damascus and new sovereignty of the Umayyads under the name of the Marwānids, on the other hand. It has been said that 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād had been the main element who incited Marwān.[4]

Anyhow, Marwān became the founder of the Marwānīds dynasty. From different standpoints, his rule as well as the way of his assuming power gained a novelty. Although Mu'āwiya had come into power by compulsion and dissimulation, Marwān could secure it thoroughly by sword. According to Mas'ūdī, he was the first one who procured the power by sword with satisfying no group of people at least.[5]

Marwān was in dilemma. One was from the side of 'Amr Ibn Sa'īd who had played a leading role in the course of this development and was of course nominated as a successor after his son.[6] Nonetheless, he was later

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 255

[2]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.II, p.16; the seed of discord between these two groups was sown when Mu'āwiya married a woman from Kalb. The tribe of Qays not least Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Qays felt that their social reputation was blackened. The Kalbids turned to the Umayyads and the Qaysids took position against them; Tārīkh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, p. 177

[3]. Tārīkh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, p. 177

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, pp. 138, 141

[5]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 86

[6]. Tārīkh al-khulafā', p. 218

slayed by 'Abd al-Malik mercilessly. Another problem was Khālid Ibn Yazīd Ibn Mu'āwiya who had secured allegiance from a number of Jordanians in the turmoil of clashes. For the purpose of disparaging him, Marwān married his mother. His affront was followed by Khālid's objection to his mother and Marwān's assassination by his new wife in 65.[1]

Probably Marwān had staged a coup to conquer Ḥidjāz although some sources have ascribed it to 'Abd al-Malik. Overpowering Ibn Zubayr's army in Medina, Ḥubaysh Ibn Duladja entered the town and began eating dates on the Prophet's pulpit. Afterwards, he set out to Rabada, where he battled with the army dispatched by 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr. The majority of Damascus came to be killed and captured.[2] It is alleged that Ḥadidjādj had been in Ḥubaysh's army as well.

Marwān's background bears no luminous point. His first political emergence was that as 'Uthmān's son-in-law in the throes of 'Uthmān's conflict with people, he wrote a letter to the ruler of Egypt on behalf of 'Uthmān and without his awareness to decimate Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr and his friends. Later on, he was the governor of Medina for years during which he constantly insulted Imām 'Alī (a).[3] When Yazīd after his father's death urged Medinans governor to secure allegiance from Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī (a), Marwān suggested that he be killed if balking at.

Morally, he was described, كان مروان فاحشاً سباباً[4] "Marwān was extremely foul mouthed."

Marwān's rule lasted for nine months. After his assassination in 65 A.H his son, 'Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwān, assumed the caliphate. Before that 'Abd al-Malik was well known for his worship and Qur'ān recitation in Medina.[5] No sooner had he heard about his caliphate than he shut Qur'ān and bid farewell to it forever.[6]

His main internal problem was the existence of 'Amr Ibn Sa'īd who was supposed to succeed him at his father's behest. When 'Abd al-Malik went to

---

[1].Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, pp. 144, 145; Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 257; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.V, p. 146

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p. 153; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.II, p. 181; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.V, p. 151

[3]. Tardjamat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, Ibn Sa'd, p. 143 عن عمير بن اسحاق، كان مروان اميراً علينا ثم اعيد مروان فكان يسب عليا...ستّ سنين فكان يسبّ عليا في كل جمعة علي المنبر "'Umayr Ibn Ishāq narrated, "Marwān who was our ruler for six years insulted 'Alī every Friday on the pulpit... »

[4]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.II, p. 17

[5].'Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p. 372; Tārikh al-khulafā' of Ibn Sa'd, p. 216

[6]. Tārikh al-khulafā', p. 217

conquer Iraq in 68, 'Amr Ibn Sa'īd revolted in Damascus and besieged it. Returning halfway, 'Abd al-Malik introduced him as his successor deceitfully and after a while killed him.[1] This action did divulge 'Abd al-Malik's profound deceitfulness in history and such person as Ibn 'Abbās applied it to their propagation against him.[2]

Before Mukhtār rose up, 'Abd al-Malik had endeavored to conquer Iraq by making use of 'Uthmān-oriented individuals in Baṣra. He sent Khālid Ibn 'Abd Allāh to Baṣra carrying a message for the nobles. Later, an army headed by Mālik Ibn Misma' was dispatched too, but both unable to conquer Baṣra fled to Damascus. This event was recorded in history as, يوم الجفرة بالبصرة[3] "Yawm al-Djafra Bi l-baṣra"

This very event had likely been recorded by Ibn A'tham as being led by Zaḥr Ibn Qays. He had written that 'Abd al-Malik had pleaded with the Marwānids to adopt a measure and uproot Ibn Zubayr's dominion. He had sent Zaḥr Ibn Qays accompanied by a one-thousand-soldier army to Baṣra; however, the battle resulted in the Marwānīds's serious defeat.

Muṣ'ab, Iraqi governor, compelled Baṣran Marwānids to divorce their wives, he confiscated their properties and demolished their houses.[4] Yet, it indicated that he could not materialize his aim easily. To solve his problems and reinforce his forces, he compromised the Romans[5] -as Mu'āwiya had done so when at war with Imām 'Alī (a)- and could suppress troubled areas of Greater Syria like Palestine ruled by Nātil Ibn Qays Djudhāmī. After years in 72,he reached a decision to conquer Iraq. Noticing how Nātil Ibn Qays was vanquished, Muṣ'ab Zubayī with an intent to conquer Damascus had to dispense with it.[6]

While the Khāridjites had been making so many obstacles for the Zubayrids from the late 60s and early 70s, 'Abd al-Malik, determined to conquer Iraq, was busy mobilizing troops. The Zubayrids's dominion in oriental Islamic lands and Ḥidjāz lasted nine years (eight years in Iraq). Although 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr himself was far more popular than the Umayyads, some of his specifications made all those able to be helpful for him disperse.[7] His miserliness[1] and accusing others of being worldly were what had all leave him on his own. It is said about his jealousy,

---

[1]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 599; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, pp. 137, 138; vol.V, p. 150

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.144

[3]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp. 155, 157

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.VI, p. 256

[5]. Murūdj al-dhahab. vol.III, p. 98; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p. 300

[6]. Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 269; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 98

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p. 29

عدمت قريشا رضوا بك سيدا و أنت بخيل الكف غير جواد

"You killed the Quraysh who approved you. The miser is you."

In spite of the pressure exerted by Muṣ'ab Ibn Zubayr, the Zubayrids had not a firm foundation in Baṣra in the light of the fact that Baṣra belonged to both Djamal participants and the Marwānids as well as the 'Uthmānids. In Kūfa, on the other hand, due to its relative Shi'ism, they had no stronghold. The suppression of Mukhtār's uprising had bitterly agitated the Shi'ite Muslims. 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr's enmity with the Hāshimites not least with Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya had doubled the Shi'ite Muslims' disgust. It is said about Muṣ'ab Ibn Zubayr that he had been invariably seeking after the Shi'ite Muslims' murder.[2]

Consecutive wars with the Khāridjites caused many other people to rebel. A grudge which 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr bore his enemies ended in his disreputation among people. Bearing the Hāshimites a grudge (according to himself from 40 years ago)[3], he even was reluctant to recite Muḥammad (s) blessing in his sermons and said if so, his household would show off that they were the prophet's progeny![4] These factors accounted for Ibn Zubayr's weakness in both Iraq and Ḥidjāz; nevertheless, his influence on Ḥidjāz was more than Iraq. Although his debacle might be blamed on Iraq's not support, 'Abd al-Malik's might, his dependence on Damascus army, proverbial for their obedience to the caliphs,[5] and especially Ḥadjdjādj's coercion on Damascus people to move to Iraq[6] were considered as the reasons for Ibn Zubayr's defeat and 'Abd al-Malik's victory.

Inasmuch as Ibn Zubayr's base was shakier in Iraq, 'Abd al-Malik moved to Baṣra in 72. لم يبق شريف الا كاتبه "There was no nobleman who had not written to him."

As all of the distinguished people had written to him but Muhallab Ibn Abī Ṣufra,[7]upon waging the war, a great number left Muṣ'ab's army joining to that of Damascus.[8] He resisted to the bitter end and while breathing his last, he asked 'Urwa Ibn Mughīra what Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī did when martyred. He responded that neverever was Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī convinced to do Ibn Ziyād's bidding.

---

1. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p. 197
2. 'Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p. 197
3. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha of Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XX, p. 147
4. Ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 261; al-Aghānī, vol.II, p. 277
5. Wafayāt al-a'yān, vol.I, p. 252
6. al-'Iqd al-Farīd, vol.V, p. 158
7. 'Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p. 333
8. Loc.cit

Muṣ'ab then said,

إنّ الألي بالطف من آل هاشم تأسّوا فسنّوا للكرام التواسيا[1]

"Those pearls in Karbalā were from the Hāshimites who chose the best as their model."

One ground for Muṣ'ab's fragility was Ibrāhīm Ibn Mālik Ashtar's murder.[2] He defied however, until he was removed. As long as the Zubayrids held sway in Iraq, he was the most important Zubayrids element ruling there except a short while. He had Arabic racial prejudice particularly he was more pessimistic about the Iranians who had accompanied Mukhtār.[3]

Following the clashes, Iraqi residents swore allegiance to 'Abd al-Malik; therefore, the Marwānids became dominant entirely in oriental Islamic lands. The only remaining land was Ḥidjāz ruling by 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr, 'Abd al-Malik, who had already perceived the sensitivity of Ḥidjāz due to the rite of Ḥadjdj (pilgrimage) and even had banned it, contemplated how to seize that land, especially with Ibn Zubayr's involvement in political scenes punctuation there existed some people who had not yet deemed his caliphate legitimate.[4] Among them was 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar who neither had likely sworn allegiance to 'Alī nor had he participated in his wars but immediately after Ibn Zubayr's assassination, he nightly went to Ḥadjdjādj and swore allegiance to him.[5]

'Abd al-Malik sent Ḥadjdjādj Ibn Yūsuf Thaqafī to Ḥidjāz for conquering Mecca. He stopped in Ṭā'if, center of Thaqīf tribe, temporarily and then betook himself to Mecca. It was the second military expedition that the Umayyads made against Mecca for the purpose of overwhelming Ibn Zubayr. The first time in 64 Ḥusayn Ibn Numayr, the commander of Damascus army, returned upon learning Yazīd's death, but this time Ḥadjdjādj was engaged in besieging Mecca with his troops as many as 12000 for eight months.[6] During this period, catapults were installed around

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 6; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.V, p. 344

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.VI, p. 266

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 5; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, pp. 161, 162-163

[4]. Suyūṭī had said that since he secured allegiance as his father's successor during Ibn Zubayr's caliphate, his caliphate was not rightful. Once in power in Damascus and Egypt, later he seized power in Iraq until Ibn Zubayr was killed in 73. From then on his caliphate was right; Tārīkh al-khulafā', p. 215.

[5]. al-Īḍāḥ, p. 34; al-mustarshid fī l-Imāma, p. 16; concerning his political votes we have discussed in detail in. "the History of Caliphate from Islam's Emergence to the Sufyānids' fall". (Tārīkh taḥawwul dawla wa khilāfat)

[6]. Wafayāt al-a'yān, vol.III, p. 73

the town on the heights targetting Ibn Zubayr and al-Ḥarām Mosque under a rain of fire and stones.[1] It was carried on until Ka'ba caught fire. So insolent was he that he even did not avoid throwing garbage on al-Ḥarām Mosque.[2] On Djamādī al-Thānī 10th, 73 A.H Mecca was eventually blockaded by the Umayyads. Subseqently, Ḥadjdjādj moved to Medina and narratedly he affronted the remaining from the Prophet's disciples such as Djābir Ibn 'Abd Allāh, Mālik Ibn Anas, Sahl Ibn Sa'd, etc.[3]

From then onwards, the Marwānids governed in all Muslim- populated areas. A barbaric man, 'Abd al-Malik together with some other brutal rulers including Ḥadjdjādj, Yazīd Ibn Muhallab as well as Hishām Ibn Ismā'īl[4] made people feel sword. He believed that sword was the only panacea for people.[5]

He abominated "enjoining the lawful acts" and said, والله لا يأمرني أحد بتقوى الله بعد مقامي هذا الا ضربت عنقه "If anyone enjoins me fearing Allāh, I will break his neck."[6]

Like any other person on the very last days of his lifetime, he wished he had been born porter.[7]

ḤADJDJĀDJ IN IRAQ

The main element that laid the foundation of caliphate was no one but Ḥadjdjādj. Regarding him, 'Abd al-Malik told his sons later, "It was Ḥadjdjādj who aided us to come to the throne".[8] Yazīd Ibn Abī Muslim, Ḥadjdjādj's scribe had said that he had bent his thoughts and efforts to serve the Umayyads.[9]

To reason the superiority of a caliph over the Holy Prophet (s), he himself had affirmed, أخليفة أحدكم في أهله أكرم أم رسوله في حاجته[10] "In your sight, is

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.VI, p. 276

[2]. Ibid, vol.II, p. 486; 'Uqalā' al-madjānīn, p. 178 cited form al-Ṣaḥiḥ Min Sīrat al-nabī (s), vol.I, p. 23

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 35; Tārīkh al-khulafā', p. 215

[4]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 90 وكان له اقدام علي الدماء وكان عمّاله على مثـــل مذهبـــه "He was bloodthirsty and so were his agents.

[5]. Tārīkh al-khulafā', p. 218

[6]. Ibid, pp. 218, 219

[7]. Ibid, p. 220

[8]. Ibid, p. 220; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.II, p. 58

[9]. Wafayāt al-a'yān, vol.II, p. 425

[10]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 147. The same narration has been asscribed to Khālid Ibn 'Abd Allāh Qasrī, Mecca governor in 89. Comparing Walīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik with

the one as your substitute in the family dearer or the one sent to do something?"

According to Djāḥiz, he had been annoyed when people paid homage to the Prophet's tomb and said as a consequence, هلا طافوا بقصر أمير المؤمنين عبد الملك، الا يعلمون أن خليفة المرء خير من رسوله[1] "Why did you not pay homage to the palace of Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Abd al-Malik? Do you not know the caliph is the best one after the Apostle."

Ḥadjdjādj's this reasoning was repeated by many others too for ingratiating.[2]

Ḥadjdjādj had been so devoted to 'Abd al-Malik that he had said, "If I learn that demolishing Ka'ba did never draw 'Abd al-Malik's gratification, I shall break it into stones".[3]

Realizing his devotion, when 'Abd al-Malik designated Ḥadjdjādj as the governor of Iraq, he told his scribe, اكتب عهده علي العراقين واطلق يده علي الرجال والسلاح والاموال "Write the permission of his governorship in both Baṣra and Kūfa and make him fully authorized about people, properties and weapons"[4]

With Ḥadjdjādj's arrival in Iraq that had never had a taste of the 60s-peace could be returned for twenty years with Ḥadjdjādj's sword. Since his roughness was extraordinary no one dared oppose him. However, it would be seen how such a pressure sparked off riots at last. On arrival in Kūfa, he announced, "The caliph had given me two swords of mercy and requital. On my way here, I lost the sword of mercy and the only sword remained is of requital!"[5] In the same sermon, he indicted Iraqi people of schism, hypocrisy and moral corruption[6]; accordingly, he belittled the Kūfiyāns who were, ذو هيئة وعزة "The respectful people."

As stated by Ibn A'tham and took them under his yoke.[7] His emergence in Iraq had previously foretold by Imām 'Alī (a) when pronouncing the

---

Prophet Ibrāhīm (a) on the pulpit, he introduced Walīd as the superior one. He said that when Ibrāhīm asked for water, Allāh offered him salty water while He offered fresh water to Walīd. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 225.

[1]. al-Naṣāyiḥ al-kāfiya li-man Yatawallā Mu'āwiya, p. 81; al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol..IX, p. 136

[2]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p. 228

[3]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.II, p. 52

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.VII, p. 3

[5]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.II, p.32

[6]. al-Futūḥ, vol.VII, p.8; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.43; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.132; Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.273

[7]. al-Futūḥ, vol.VII, p.4

malediction of اللهم عجل عليهم بالغلام الثقفي[1] "O Allāh! Hasten the appearance of the man from the tribe of Thaqīf."

Yet, it had been later attributed to 'Umar.[2]

Ḥadjdjādj's delight in homicide created a myth that when a baby, he was notbreastfed but fed with blood and it had been Satan's suggestion under the guise of a human.[3] Ibn Khallakān has written, و كان للحجاج في القتل وسفك الدماء والعقوبات غرائب لم يسمع مثلها[4] "Many a story has been recounted about massacre and torture done by Ḥadjdjādj that were unparalleled at all."[5]

The aftermath of his great savagery in Iraq was the slaughter of more than 120000 people.[6] Nearly 50000 men and 30000 women, half of whom unmarried, were confined in his mixed jails.[7]

Characterizing him, Suyūṭī has written, و قد قتل من الصحابة والتابعين ما لا يحصي، فضلاً عن غيرهم وختم في عنق انس وغيره من الصحابة ختماً "He massacred countless Prophet's disciples and followers let alone others. He made some gashes on Anas Ibn Mālik's neck and other's."[8]

From 75 to 95, Ḥadjdjādj was the absolute ruler in Iraq and oriental Islamic lands including Khurāsān, Sīstān and all other Iranian areas. Despite the existing hindrances, he had been so preoccupied with suppressing the Khāridjites, Shi'ite Muslims and any rebel Sunnites that no conquest, except during the last years, was made. What ought to be borne in mind is that Ḥadjdjādj had numerous rivals in Iraq but he removed them all barbarically.

His first enemy was the Khāridjites. Only Qaṭarī Ibn Fudjā'a, a Khāridjites leader, engaged him for years. After their defeat in Kirmān and the Khāridjites' split, it was Shabīb who occupied Kūfa twice for hours. Ultimately after a long clash, Ḥadjdjādj could accomplish to suppress them with recourse to Damascus.[9] The Khāridjites were scattered in various districts of Iraq as well. More than half of Ḥadjdjādj's prisoners were either Khāridjites or being accused of it.

---

[1]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.142

[2]. Shadhārāt al-dhahab fī Akhbār Min dhahab, vol.I, p.107

[3]. Wafayāt al-a'yān, vol.II, p.30; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.132

[4]. Wafayāt al-a'yān, vol.II, p.31

[5]. Ibid, p.30

[6]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.183; Mu'djam al-buldān, vol.V, p.349

[7]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.166

[8]. Tārīkh al-khulafā', p.221

[9]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, pp.274, 275

Another group was the Shi'ite Muslims opposing Ḥadjdjādj in Iraq. As a consequence of the penitents and Mukhtār's defeat in 65 and 67 respectively, Shi'ite Muslims were scattered losing their solidarity. 'Abd al-Malik who had no apparent fight with 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib's progeny, had advised Ḥadjdjādj in a letter to adopt the same strategy. As written by Ibn 'Abd Rabbih not a single objection did Ḥadjdjādj raised to the Ṭālibites.[1] It never implied that he was not at odds with the Shi'ite Muslims but it was on account of the fact that no Ṭālibites lived in Iraq. Nontheless, the Shi'ite Muslims residing in Kūfa and other spots of the country were under the worst pressure. As stated by Imām Bāqir (a) hearing the word "'Alī's Shi'ites Muslim" was far less tolerable for Ḥadjdjādj than the word dualism or "atheist".[2]

Whatever made him pleased was to hear a person from a tribe saying, "No one in our tribe has ever cursed 'Uthmān; in Ṣiffīn, seventy people from our tribe had been with Mu'āwiya while only one with Abū Turāb; no woman from women has ever felt in affection for Abū Turāb; there has been found no one in our tribe whom we urged to curse Abū Turāb in addition to Ḥasan, Ḥusayn and Fāṭima and he disobeyed.[3]

In order to pressurize them to curse 'Alī (a), Ḥadjdjādj whipped such individuals as 'Aṭiyya Ibn Sa'd 'Awfī four hundred lashes for their amity with 'Alī (a), 'Aṭiyya defied, however.[4] Those intending to wheedle Ḥadjdjādj, manipulated such values.

'Alī Ibn Asma' came up to Ḥadjdjādj and said, انّ أبويّ عقّاني فسمّياني عليّاً فسمّني أنت "My parents have not only disowned me but also named me 'Alī. Change my name. Changing his name, Ḥadjdjādj offered him presents."[5]

Even the simplest Shi'ites idea was followed by Ḥadjdjādj perturbation. He, for instance, summoned Yaḥyā Ibn Ya'mur from Khurāsān to Iraq due to announcing that both Ḥasan (a) and Ḥusayn(a) were the Prophet's descendants. He merely contented himself with his banishment once Yaḥyā could validate his notion through authenticating that Jesus Christ had been Ibrāhīm's descendant too on the strength of Qur'ān.[6] As Ḥadjdjādj laid

---

[1]. al-'Iqd al-Farīd, vol.V, p.149

[2]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.II, p.44

[3]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.144; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.IV, p.61.

[4]. Shadhārāt al-dhahab, vol.I, p.144

[5]. Wafayāt al-a'yān, vol.III, p.175

[6]. Ibid, vol.VI, p.147

stress on affection for 'Uthmān, he, in his turn, murdered any one suspected of participating in riots against 'Uthmān before.[1]

'Abd al-Malik and his agents had been persistently attempting to boost the fights between the 'Alawites and the Zubayrids for the purpose of keeping them engaged. It was in one of these certain meetings that Imām Sadjdjād did not attend feigning illness.[2] 'Alī's lineage was coerced by 'Abd al-Malik to curse 'Alī while the Zubayrids were so to curse 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr.[3] His son, Sulaymān Ibn 'Abd al-Malik, perpetuated this policy pressurizing people to curse Imām 'Alī (a) under threat of murder.[4]

In such a financially tough situation did the Prophet's Household live under the Umayyads pressure that later the Iraqi ruler had said concerning them, أن أهل هذا البيت من بني هاشم [بني علي] قد كانوا هلكوا جوعاً حتى كانت همة أحدهم قوت يومه "This family from the Hāshimites was under threat of starvation to the extent that they only bent their efforts to earn their daily bread."[5]

Besides the Shi'ite Muslims and the Khāridjites, Ḥadjdjādj encountered other adversaries who had risen up against the Umayyads's oppression or for whatever reason. The first year Ḥadjdjādj came in power in Iraq, he cut out the surplus proportion from Bayt al-Māl (public treasury) to Baṣra people. This action culminated in Baṣra revolt in 75 led by 'Abd Allāh Ibn Djārūd although it was immediately stifled.[6] Another movement was led by Muṭarraf Ibn Mughīra who himself and whose father had been from the kins of the Umayyads and the governors of Kūfa and Ctesiphon but was affected by the Khāridjites. When the representatives of Khāridjites Shabīb met with Muṭarraf, he proposed that after gaining victory the caliph be determined by a council and be from the Quraysh. Neither of his conditions was approved by the Khāridjites, however.[7]

The motivations he himself had enumerated for his insurrection against Ḥadjdjādj were, الاستئثار بالفيء وتعطيل الحدود والتسلط بالجبريّة "Misappropriation of public treasury, transgression of divine limits and despotism."[8]

He along with his followers left Ctesiphon to Qaṣr Shīrīn and after a stop-over on the outskirts of Iṣfahān to Sāmān district and then to Qum and

---

[1]. al-Muwaffaqiyyāt, p.99

[2]. Nasab Quraysh, Muṣ'ab Zubayr, pp.47, 48

[3]. Nasab Quraysh, Zubayr Ibn Bakkār, p.83

[4]. Wafayāt al-a'yān, vol.II, p.426

[5]. Ibid, vol.VII, p.106

[6]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.46

[7]. Ibid, vol.V, pp.108, 109

[8] Ibid, vol.V, p.108

Kāshān.[1] Gradually some people from Riy and Iṣfahān, naturally many Arabs and likely a few Iranians, joined him. In a letter, Iṣfahān governor wrote to Ḥadjdjādj if he wanted the city, he should hasten. The Arab governor of Hamadān for his part asked for Ḥadjdjādj's permission to suppress Muṭarraf, since the scattering of Arabs in the lands paying tax had appalled him, he declined his proposal.[2] By the same token, an army composed of Damascus and Riy people could finally manage to chuckle down Muṭarraf's movement in 77 AH.

Afterwards, 'Abd al-Malik entrusted all eastern lands up to Khurāsān and Sīstān borders to Ḥadjdjādj. Ḥadjdjādj who had conquered nowhere as yet - even halted from Yazīd's time before him-decided to take an action in this respect and bring further booties for the Umayyads. His determination to dispatch an army for the conquests faced a hurdle for surmounting which behooved him to devote one or two years.[3]

'ABD AL-RAḤMĀN IBN ASH'ATH'S RIOT

'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Ash'ath Ibn Qays was selected as the commander of a massive Iraqi army to launch his conquests while neither he nor his household was good enough towards Ahl al-Bayt. As it was mentioned by Imām Ṣādiq (a), Ash'ath was an accomplice in 'Alī's martyrdom his daughter, Dju'da, was the murderer of Imām Ḥasan and his son, Muḥammad, was an agent in Imām Ḥusayn's martyrdom.[4] 'Abd al-Raḥmān was once appointed by the Zubayrids to amass alms in Medina.[5] Heading for Sīstān in 80 A.H. along with his army, he made up his mind to bring the fight to a standstill until the next year after being somehow victorious. Proposing this to Ḥadjdjādj, he refused it; consequently, neither 'Abd al-Raḥmān nor his army accepted to approve Ḥadjdjādj's demand while knowing the laborious task encumbered upon them. Later, this came to be an excuse for them the to be at odds both with Ḥadjdjādj and the Umayyads.

Iraqi rebellious army, instead of conquering new lands, returned to Iraq while being fully equipped to rebel against that country but since the Arabs

---

[1]. Ibid, vol.V, p.113

[2]. Ibid, vol.V, p.115

[3]. In recent years, (1405 A.H) a book entitled "al-Ḥadjdjādj Radjul al-dawlat al-Muftarā 'Alayh" was published in Iraq for defending Ḥadjdjādj.

[4]. Rawḍa al-kāfi, p.245

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p.60

were not in Sīstān, it would have been much easier for them to gain victory if this riot had happened in Khurāsān.[1]

'Abd al-Raḥmān called upon people to adhere both to Qur'ān and the Prophet's Sunna, depose misleading leaders and combat the unbelievers.[2] His army entered Baṣra in 81 A.H.. The residents of Baṣra, both those who knew Qur'ān by heart and the readers thereof as well as the doyen altogether gave a helping hand in overthrowing 'Abd al-Malik. People in Kūfa also joined him utterly.[3] From among the rioters, the followers of Ibn Ash'ath, there were huge numbers of Qur'ān readers and scores of Iraqi jurisprudents[4] such as Ibn Abī Laylā, someone who was battered and pushed by Ḥadjdjādj to insult 'Alī (a).[5] The majority of those adoring 'Alī played a significant role in this uprising. Kumayl Ibn Ziyād was a commander of a group of Qur'ān readers.[6] Being embarrassed, 'Abd al-Malik, put forward the idea of unsenting Ḥadjdjādj in order to maintain peace; however, owing to the fact that both 'Abd al-Raḥmān and his supporters who on one hand, had a taste of being triumphant and, on the other hand, did not feel confident enough whether he would carry out his undertaking or not, failed to accept his suggestion.[7] Moreover, they were not in opposition to Ḥadjdjādj but basically to the Umayyads and it was reasonably evident from their remarks in deposing 'Abd al-Malik.

To prompt people to revolt against the Umayyads, some vocalized 'Alī's remarks. This was an indication of the presence of those tending to Shi'ism.[8]

Such a trend of this riot, in comparison to that of Tawwābīn's and Mukhtār's was not so noticeable. Above all, someone was leading the riot who behaved not well towards Ahl al-Bayt. The only reason for various parties to join hands was not more than enmity to the Umayyads and to overthrow Ḥadjdjādj. From among the notions they repeatedly were taking advantage in their campaign against the Umayyads, one can name their brutality, disregarding the weak and attempting to leave no trace of prayers. قاتلوهم على جورهم في الحكم وتجبرهم في الدين واستذلالهم الضعفاء وإماتتهم الصلاة[9] "Fight them to

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.149

[2]. Ibid. vol.v, p.149

[3]. Ibid. vol.v, p.155

[4]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.6, p.293

[5]. Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ, vol.1, p.58

[6]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.158

[7]. Ibid. vol.v, p.157

[8]. Ibid. vol.v, p.163; It has been told in a quotation in 'Umdat al-ṭālib, he had paid allegiance to one of the 'Alawites.

[9]. Ibid. vol.v, p.163

get rid of their cruelty in ruling their bullyism in religion, their violation of the rights of the weak and their attempt of disregarding prayers."

One of the prime reasons that brought about this riot was Ḥadjdjādj's compulsion on the villagers who recently had embraced Islam and moved into cities. Tax deduction, consequence of that migration, impelled Ḥadjdjādj to drive them out of those cities and re-settle them where they had been. Being under hard pressure, they cried out, "O, Muḥammad!"[1] This caused them to tilt towards 'Abd al-Raḥmān to kill Ḥadjdjādj. Besides, sending the Iraqis to the most remote areas to fight simply for the booties which were handed to Ḥadjdjādj ultimately was another reason for their rebellion.[2] The impact of taking capitation from newlly converted Mawālī should also be taken into account. It was told that the majority of the rioters were jurisprudent, Baṣra's soldiers as well as Mawālī.[3]

'Abd al-Raḥmān's riot continued until 83 A.H. when Dayr al-Djamādjim event, one of the foremost strike, took place. Due to his defeat and the captivity of extensive numbers of his supporters, 'Abd al-Raḥmān was not able to withstand in the subsequent clashes. Eventually, he returned to Sīstān and on his way to Khurāsān. Most of his supporters separated from him. Then he took refuge by one of the kings in Harāt. Ratbīl, the king of that land, concluded a treaty with Ḥadjdjādj in 85 A.H. in which he had promised to send 'Abd al-Raḥmān's head to Ḥadjdjādj.

Massacring a large number of Dayr al-Djamādjim's captives, Ḥadjdjādj set free only those confessing that they were infidel. There, among them, were a handful of Iraqi jurisprudents.[4] Sha'bī was one of the jurisprudents, who surrendered himself to Ḥadjdjādj after being defeated. Another one was Sa'īd Ibn Djubayr who was apprehended by the governor of Medina, Khālid Ibn'Abd Allāh Qasrī. Inquiring about his viewpoint with respect to the previous caliphs, which was an indication of being skeptical of trusting them, Ḥadjdjādj put an end to his life. From then on, Ḥadjdjādj was suffering from a severe psychical disorder because of Sa'īd's murder.[5] They kept on killing the captives to such an extent that 'Abd al-Raḥmān himself complained about it to Ḥadjdjādj.[6]

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī. vol.v, p.182

[2]. Tārīkh al-Dawlat al-'arabiyya, p.225

[3]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.3, p.364

[4]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.v, p.169; al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.2, p.47

[5]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.2, p.54; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.156

[6]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.133; Tahdhīb Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.4, p.67; Wafayāt al-a'yān vol.2, p.35

Ibn Ash'ath's clash with Ḥadjdjādj was the fourth one out of the strings of clashes between Iraq and Damascus. The three previous ones were once with 'Alī (a) and with the penitents and Mukhtār, another time with Muṣ'ab and finally with Ibn Ash'ath. This time again the dispersed Iraqi people failed to succeed and the people of Damascus, due to their solidarity as well as unsparing contribution to the Umayyads Caliphs, came to be triumphant.

'Abd al-Malik died in 86 A.H. while he had managed, with assistance of Ḥadjdjādj, to eliminate monstrous problems facing the Umayyads and pave the ground for the Marwānids. It is said that he was the initiator of some event in the Islamic history. Being the first one ever to carve name of Allāh and His prophet on coins, the first and foremost jealous, cunning and treacherous caliph, the first to proscribe speaking in the presence of caliphs, to enjoin the good and to change the records of public treasury tribunal account from Arabic to Persian. He was also the first to include prayer call prior to performing the prayers of two Festivals namely the Fast breaking and Sacrifice. [1] After him, his son, Walīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik came to power. Regarding Walīd and his agents 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz stated, "Walīd in Damascus, Ḥadjdjādj in Iraq, 'Uthmān Ibn Ḥayyān in Ḥidjāz and Qurra Ibn Sharīk in Egypt are all individuals prevailing oppression throughout the Earth. امتلاء الارض والله جوراً[2] "While there is much cruelty on the Earth."

It has been told about Walīd that, اول من تجبّر من الخلفاء[3] "He was the first ever cruel caliph."

The Umawī mosque in Damascus is one of the most significant monuments built in his term. The apparent tranquility of the period from Shawwāl, 86 A.H. to Djamādī al-Thānī, 96 A.H. all over the Islamic lands once again led to conquering new lands to such an extent that, according to Dhahabī, "The conquests of his term regained the same splendor as that of 'Umar Ibn Khaṭṭāb's term".[4] The most important assault was, on one hand, against Constantinople and, on the other hand, against Andalusia.

Walīd, just the same as his father, was indebted to Ḥadjdjādj, one of his best counselors. Once a crowd of Iraqi people went to Medina to meet 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz, the governor, and he wrote a letter of complaint to Walīd. Thereafter, Walīd in consultation with Ḥadjdjādj deposed him from

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-Khulafā', p.218, It is uncertain whether he had mint coins or not.

[2]. Ibid. p.223

[3]. Tārīkh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, p.216; Ansāb al-ashrāf, p.243

[4]. Tārīkh al-khulafā', p.225

Medina's governorship. Then he singled out 'Uthmān Ibn Ḥayyān Marrī instead of him. He sent Iraqi refugees kept in fetters to Ḥadjdjādj.[1]

The subsequent governor of the Islamic lands from Djamādī al-Thānī, 96 to Ṣafar, 99 A.H., Sulaymān Ibn 'Abd al-Malik, selected 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz his successor. As it was touched upon formerly, this period should be labelled as a peaceful one following constant attacks of 'Abd al-Malik in stabilizing his position in the shadow of which the Umayyads caliphs could not only expand their conquests but strengthen their economy as well. In addition, the internal political disputes, a severe strike on the economy of the society, were eliminated too. That was why Walīd was widely known as the best caliph for Damascus.[2] Annoying and chasing the companions of Ḥadjdjādj were some of the actions of Sulaymān, the main reason of which was a dispute between Ḥadjdjādj and him when he was their apparent.[3]

Ḥadjdjādj was killed in 95 A.H.. To speak about him what Shurayḥ had said will suffice. According to him, he was an unbeliever.[4] Upon hearing the news of his death, Ḥasan Baṣrī prostrated to show his gratitude to Allāh.[5]

'UMAR IBN 'ABD AL-'AZĪZ'S ADMINISTRATION

For the historians dealing with the Umayyads caliphs, 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz, ruling from 99 to 101 A.H. is an eminent figure. For in comparison with them not others, he was a man of outstanding features. In his studies about the approaches of kings, Ibn Athīr stated that he could not find anyone better than him in conduct succeeding to Orthodox Caliphs.[6] He is usually regarded as the fifth member of them.[7] This statement of Imām Bāqir (a) is probably right that he was the Umayyads's nobleman.[8] Being Medina's governor, as it was said, he was in touch with traditionalists as well as jurisprudents, so he was also an specialist in this regard.[9] However, he himself said that he could remember what he had learnt just during the period he was in Medina and he forgot it no later than he entered Damascus

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.2, pp.1285,1261; quoted from Tārīkh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya p.247

[2]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.v, p.173

[3]. Tārīkh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, vol.v, p.250

[4]. Wafayāt al-a'yān, vol.2, p.463

[5]. Ibid. vol.2, (the footnote), al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.v, p.49

[6]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.1, p.403

[7]. Ibid. vol.v, p.65

[8]. Ibid. vol.v, p.62; Siyar a'lām al-nubalā', No.7, p.589, vol.v, p.117

[9]. al-Aghānī, vol.9, p.273

(assuming caliphate).[1] Radjā' Ibn Ḥaywa, one of the linked learned to the Umayyads' caliphs, did make great endeavor bringing him to power.[2] We had already spoken about him.

To know both him and his policy in ruling the Islamic society, no matter Whether he had a political or religious aim in has term, a point of great importance should be taken into account. He had made great endeavor to bring justice to that society and not to be a cruel rule. He also had directed his attention towards the accepted merits of a typical Islamic society, Observing religious tenets and respecting at least some of the popular individuals. He had tried to show a religious image of his caliphate too. Most likely, he had understood that the situation of the society would lead soon to overthrowing of the Umayyads. What was required then was a radical change for the stabilization of them. It is worthwhile to review his reactions towards different groups from various aspects.

ENCOUNTERING THE SHI'ITE MUSLIMS

Speaking about the Shi'ite Muslims, at first, does not imply that 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz wanted to be good towards them. Some of the sources inclined to the Shi'ite Muslims had tried to show that he was adherent of Imām 'Alī (a). They may have done so to say that no one from among the Umayyads's caliphs had paid attention to Ahl al-Bayt as him. Reviling 'Alī (a) in sermons formally and publicly prevailed at that time.[3] He said that from then on, noone was permitted to do so. He himself, as it was said, was doing so before, but later on, he came to know about his bad habit and always recalled 'Alī as a good man.[4] Upon coming to power not only did he himself abandon this habit but also he had his agents give it up.[5] There is no doubt, based on historical sources, that he had done so.[6] Kuthayyir 'Azza, a Shi'ites poet, composed some verses in praising 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz before him,

ولیت فلم تشتم علیّاً ولم تخف بریئاً ولم تتبعْ مقالة مجرم

---

[1]. Siyar a'lām al-nubalā', vol.v, p.121

[2]. Ibid. vol.v, p.123

[3]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.4, p.56

[4]. Siyar a'lām al-nubalā', vol. 5, p. 117

[5]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.v, p.42; It was written in one of the footnotes of the book entitled "Tārīkh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya that Wellhausen who was a researcher was doubtful about it but he had no reason for being so, see, p. 299

[6]. See, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.4, p.56; Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.2, p.305; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.3, p. 184

تكلمت بالحق المبين وإنما تبين آيات الهدي بالتكلم [1]

"Thou came to power and did not revile 'Alī (a), thou did listen to no culpable instead thou told the true word. Others came to know about Allāh's signs by listening to thy word."

It was said that he gradually enlarged his understanding of Imām 'Alī (a) specifically when he found 'Alī's letter in the Damascus public treasury. Then he informed all about it.[2]

He had been quoted as saying, أزهد الناس في الدنيا علي[3] "'Alī is the most pious person in the world."

However, it is doubtful whether he was courageous enough to be so on that occasion or not even if one disregards all of those quotations what was said about him is most likely true.

Walīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik, on the other hand, while on the pulpit quoted Allāh's Prophet, regarding 'Alī (a) and rank tradition, as saying, "Your status in comparison with me is like that of Qur'ān in comparison with Moses."[4]

It was also said that he was respecting Imām Bāqir(a).[5]

Another issue was returning Fadak to Fāṭima (a). It was a booty that was given to Fāṭima (a), with no war, by his father Muḥammad (s). This land was taken from Fāṭima, thereafter, without any apparent reason. Returning it to the 'Alawites was an indication of nullifying the order of both caliphs I and II. On the other hand, 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz, the upholder of a jurisdiction that was mostly based on the conduct of the second caliph. Such action by him, as it was said by some of the researchers, shows that he was not following the second caliph but was somehow independent.[6] Ibn Athīr by giving false account of the ownership of Fadak during the time of Orthodox Caliphs had tried to show that such deviation goes back to the time of Mu'āwiya in which he donated it to Marwān Ibn Ḥakam. It was also said that 'Uthmān had done this not Marwān. Since from the very beginning of the first caliph's term, it was not under the ownership of Ahl al-Bayt.

---

[1]. Dhahabī. Siyar a'lām al-nubalā', vol.4, p.147; al-Aghānī, vol.9, pp.258,259; Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.2, p.305; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.v, p.42; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.4, p.59

[2]. Shraḥ Nahdj al-balāgha. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd vol.6, p. 72

[3]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.3, p. 401

[4]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.VI, p.278

[5]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.XIII, pp.77-78

[6]. Tārīkh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, p. 287 (و معني هذا انه لم يكن يتبعهما اتباعاً تاما)

Ibn Athīr said, "When 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz came to power, he returned it to Fāṭima's descendants. Later on, it was taken from them once again. Ma'mūn, this time, gave it back to them.[1]

There are other narrations regarding his attention to Fāṭima's children. For instance, once he asked his governor in Medina to distribute 10000 diners among 'Alī's children. He wrote back saying that 'Alī has children among various tribes. The caliph told him to share it out among the children of Fāṭima.[2]

Abu l-Faradj Iṣfahānī had mentioned some instances of his attention to 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥasan Ibn Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī (a).[3]

When the caliph was criticized for his action, he said, "I heard Allāh's Prophet said, إنما فاطمة بضعة مني يسرّني من يسرها "Fāṭima is part of my body. Whoever makes her happy, he shall make me happy."

The he added, ليس أحد من بني هاشم الا وله شفاعة[4] "There is no one from among the Hāshimites who can intercede him before Allāh except her."

When a Mawālī of Imām 'Alī came to him, the caliph sat down on the ground and said, انا والله مولى علي "Both Allāh and I are 'Alī's friends."

Then he quoted this tradition from Allāh's Prophet, من كنت مولاه فهذا علي مولاه[5] Taking the position of the caliph into account, one doubts about the validity of those narrations. Some poets admired him for what he had done. Sayyid Razī, for example composed,

يا بن عبدالعزيز لو بكت العيـــ ن فتـــيٌ مـــن أميّة لَبكيتـــُك
غيـــر أني أقول أنـــك قد طبـــ ت وإن لم يطب ولم يذك بيتك
أنت نزهتنا عن السب والقذ ف فلو أمكن الجزاء جزيُتك[6]

"O, son of 'Abd al-Azīz, if eyes are to weep for one of the Umayyads's youths, they will surely do this for thee. Thou have been purified but not thy household. Thou had prevented us from hurling abuse at Ahl al-Bayt. I would reward thee if I could."

Since the 'Alawites were the Umayyads's successors, heading them and subsiding their long-lived rage and hatred could be constructive in the process of 'Umar II's reform movement targetting at the Umayyads's stabilization. At the same time, the Hāshimites's call, the way paved by the 'Abbāsids, started. 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz tried hard to suppress them and

---

[1]. al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.2, pp.224, 225; See, also vol.3, p. 63

[2]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.3, p. 184

[3]. al-Aghānī, vol.9, pp. 262-264

[4]. Ibid. vol.9, p. 263

[5]. Ibid. vol.9, p.264

[6]. Sharh nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol. 4, p.60

by justifying what they were doing guaranteed the survival of the Umayyads.

ENCOUNTERING THE KHĀRIDJITES

Another group threatening Umayyads was the Khāridjites. With their constant revolts, they were almost always irritating Umayyads's rulers and they could not stop them rising up against Iraqi governor and the Khāridjites could defeat them. After a while, another army was sent to the battle. This time, 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz, following his usual policy, wrote a letter to their leader, Bastām from Banū Yashkur tribe, saying, "I was informed that you had revolted just for the sake of Allāh and His Prophet. Bear in mind that I am superior to you in this regard but let's debate. If we were right, you should follow us like others and if you were right, we would take your advice."

Bastām accepted what he said and sent a person to talk to him.

In this regard, Ṭabarī stopped short of saying anything but touching upon the fact that the Khāridjites deemed it improper to pay allegiance to Yazīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik. Pretending not to know anything about this, 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz said that he should think about it more. He also went on to say that he was poisoned to death by the Marwānids for what he had said.[1]

In contrast, Mas'ūdī gave an extended account thereof stating, "Admitting the caliph's approach as a fair and square one, the Khāridjites declared (at least as a debate) that if he were so, he would be at adds with his tribe and as a result a cruel one. So he should not only curse them but also turn away from them in disgust. Attempting to reprove them, by setting an example, 'Umar asked them whether they trusted Abū Bakr and him or not. They said that they did.

Then he said, "Abū Bakr had fought against the infidels and held captives, but once 'Umar came to power, he set them all free."

As a result, he nullified what Abū Bakr had done.

Then he said, "Did he abhor him then?"

"No he did not", the Khāridjites replied.

Taking into account the Khāridjites' reaction in just the same situation, he asked them if they despised one another or not. He said that for the very same reason he should not curse his dynasty. Out of those who were sent to debate, one did join the Khāridjites but the second one did not.

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, pp.310, 311

Mas'ūdī further says that there are other narrations about the relationships between 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz and the Khāridjites. Besides, he has mentioned the debates and exchange of letters in his book titled Akhbār al-Zamān and in other books.[1]

Obviously, these actions have been taken during two years or so of government according to a certain policy. This made the Khāridjites lose their agitation and not bother the community.

STANDING AGAINST CRUELTY AND PUBLIC EXTORTION

Diminishing the pressure of the governors on individuals was another performance of 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz. People were pessimist about the governors. Since most of the time they were taking the biggest part of the booties themselves, they also were the owners of vast lands. These could give rise to an outburst of violence and provoke both the Khāridjites and Shi'ite Muslims to support such uprising as that of 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Ash'ath's. The caliph so gave back whatsoever the Umayyads had taken from people to their real owners.[2] However, he was cautious not to take the possession of their lands. He even ordered the residents of Damascus to pay more gifts to the Umayyads but he refrained from doing the same to the residents of Iraq.[3] What is obvious is that he neither intended nor could do this since it would disperse the Umayyads, on one hand, and remove pressure from some individuals, on the other hand. Iraqis were from among those bearing the brunt. Not only were the Mawālī residing in Iran, oppressed all the time leaving out 'Alī's term, but Arabs residing in Iraq as well were pressurized by the Umayyads rulers, in particular, Ḥadjdjādj.

Ṭabarī quoted a letter in which 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz had described the situation of the residents of Damascus to their governor.

He said, "They were subject to ruthlessness, compulsion and malicious conducts of inept governors while religion was in need of justice. Then he ordered the governor of Kūfa not to collect tax from those converted to Islam and the destitute beyond their means. He also ordered them not to take anything from the affluent but tax and not to ask people to pay the salaries of tax-collectors and finally not to accept new year and Mihrgān's gifts as well as the money that was taken under the name of Darāhum al-Nikāḥ or fee for

---

[1]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.3, pp.193-191; Ibn Athīr also quoted the same statement in addition to some other remarks, see al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.v, pp.46-48

[2]. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, p.331; Siyar a'lām al-nubalā', vo.5, p.129; al-Aghānī, vol.9, p.255

[3]. Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.2, p.306

writing the books or wages for the family. Also those who are converted Muslims shall not be received tributes.[1]

The above-mentioned letter shows that the Umayyads governors were ransacking public properties. They were also taking unfair advantages of Zoroastrian's customs namely, The New Year and Ancient Autumnal Festivals by demanding presents from them on those occasions. This was just what Manṣūr 'Abbāsī was doing with the same intention. According to Imām Kāẓim (a) what they were doing was reviving Zoroastrian's customs.[2]

One further point of prime significance was collecting tax and tribute even form those who had embraced Islam. This action was prevailed by Ḥadjdjādj to compensate for the public treasury's losses. The conversion of many people to Islam and its consequence, tax reduction, he had faced many financial problems. 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz, on the other hand, by exempting those converted to Islam from paying tax, a chief reason for most of Mawālī to join 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Ash'ath, could prevent the re-occurrence of such riots. Seemingly, it was feasible and resulted in expansion of Islam. In 77, when Bukayr Ibn Wishāḥ revolted against the governor of Khurāsān, Umayya Ibn 'Abd Allāh who had gone to Bukhārā for another war, he was terrified that perhaps the number of his soldiers would not be sufficient to withstand them. However, he was told that it would suffice for him to have his town herald announce among people that whosoever embraces Islam, he shall be discharged from paying tax. In that case, he will see fifty thousand people who are the best in obedience joining him.[3]

How Islam's growth was brought to a standstill due to the severity of this kind in Ḥadjdjādj's term is quite apparent. 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz has followed the same policy.

Once an Arab and one of Mawālī came to him.

The second one told him, "O caliph, twenty thousand of Mawālis are fighting side by side with Arabs against unbelievers while they are not given anything of the spoils. An identical number of protected people (Proteges in accordance with an agreement) have embraced Islam but they are still paying tax."

'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz commanded Khurāsān's governor, Djarrāḥ Ibn 'Abd Allāh to exempt whosoever accepts Islam from paying tax and soon

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.102

[2]. Musnad al-imām al-Kāẓim (a), vol.I, pp.51-52

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.129

many people embraced Islam.[1] The west barbars had confronted just the same treatment as it quoted by Balādhurī.[2]

From among sermons as well letters quoted by him, many cases can be seen which depict the great importance attached to religion and piety. Even if they were exaggerated to a great extent to justify the Umayyads at least, on the whole, one can not deny them all.[3] It had been observed that he has been promoted to such an extent as Allāh's favorites but, as a matter of fact, it was only in comparison with the other Umayyads governors that he could attract attention. Anyhow, he was ruling while being among an Umayyads family, so his attempt was directed towards consolidating such system.

Khālid Ibn Rib'ī was quoted as saying, "I have read in Torah that both the heaven and the earth will be weeping for forty days in 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz's mourning.[4] It is quite obvious that following this way, they were attempting to increase his virtues.

One of the scientific activities of 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz was the issue of inscribing traditions proposed by him for the first time in spite of the fact that others did not heed it later. He ordered his commanders to commit the knowledge of their scholars on the paper for him.[5] Zuhrī, a scholar linked to Umayyads and contemporary with him was the first ever one embarking on it.[6] He himself had said that he was asked not only to write down traditions but also dispatch some copies thereof to other cities.[7] As it was stated in another quotation, he wrote a letter to Abū Bakr Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Ḥazm Anṣārī, a hadith-narrator and Medina's ruller on behalf of 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz saying to collect every single tradition he had heard from prophet (s) as well as whatsoever being quoted by 'Umar and send them all to him for fear that they may be forgotten.[8] He has written the same letter to the residents of Medina.[9]

In spite of the fact that it was a positive movement, even up to the midst of the third century A.H. most of the traditionalists were not still interested

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.v, p.314

[2]. See Wellhausen, Tārīkh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, p.285; Futūḥ al-buldān, p.233

[3]. See, Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, pp.315, 316, 320, 322; al-Aghānī, vol.9, pp.266, 269

[4]. Siyar a'lām al-nubalā', vol.v, p.142

[5]. 'Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, vol.9, p.337

[6]. Djāmi' Bayān al-'ilm, vol.1, pp,88, 91

[7]. Djāmi' Bayān al-'ilm, vol,1. P,92

[8]. Sunan al-dārimī, vol.1, p.126; Taqyīd al-'ilm, pp.105,106

[9]. Sunan al-dārimī, vol.1, p.126; Akhbār Iṣfahān, vol.I, p.312; Tadrīb al-rāwī, vol.I, p.312

in writing traditions and it was considered as a great blow on prophet's biography among to the Sunnites.[1]

In 101 A.H., 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz passed away. Then Yazīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik who was adherent to the consistent policy of cruelty, extortion and pressure came to power. There is a quotation indicating that he was poisoned by the Umayyads, despite the probability of its occurrence, it is nothing but a quotation which is based on assumptions.

YAZĪD IBN 'ABD AL-MALIK'S SUCCESSION

Even if we accept that 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz had carried out some reforms and improved people's attitude towards Umayyads. Thereafter, Arab caliphate of the Umayyads was rehabilitated again and extortion, cruelty towards people and inattentiveness to religion all re-appeared. As it was stated by 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Yazīd Ibn Aslamī once, in 101 A.H., Yazīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik took the place of 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz. He ordered all to follow the same direction of 'Abd al-'Azīz.

On the other hand, فأتى اربعين شيخاً فشهدوا له ما علي الخلفاء حساب ولاعذاب[2] "Forty of the elderly men approached him and bore witness before him that there would be neither chastisement nor accounts for caliphs."

Mas'ūdī has described him as,"Being a selfish man, he was after libidinous pleasure and did not permit people to visit him. He was neither conversant with the right work to do nor was he cognizant of wrongdoing to refrain from."[3]

Before Yazīd, 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz had undertaken some fiscal reforms inspite of the damages incurred on the public treasury. He not only did not ask for tribute from Muslims, something which both after and before him was prevailing, but also exempted those from paying tax to some extent. Once he was asked why prices were higher in his term while they were not so before.

In a reply he said, "Those before me were demanding the protected people to pay tax beyond their men means; consequently they were compelled to pant with whatever they had and therefore became destitute. But I do not do this, so they can sell at whatever price they want to."[4]

---

[1]. Muqadami'ī bar tārīkh tadwīn ḥadīth (An introduction to History of Hadith Compilation), Qum

[2]. Tārīkh al-Khulafā', p.246

[3]. al-Tanbīh wa l-ishrāf, p. 277

[4]. al-Kharādj, p.132

He was also called upon to collect tribute from Jews and Christians newly converted to Islam but he did not consent to it.[1] He also ordered that the tax payers residing by the coast of the Euphrates be authorized to wear golden rings as well as Ṭaylusān (mantle) [2] and also be allowed to ride on horses while they were asked to pay the surplus thereof.[3] It is visible that these undertakings were appeared to be rectifying ones in comparison with prior severity which had driven the protected people to their own native lands, then the names of those regions were sealed either on their hands or their foreheads to prevent them from going out of there. Yazīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik, on the contrary, put an end to such reforms. He in 105 A.H., commanded 'Umar Ibn Hubayra, Iraq's governor, to survey once again all of the farming lands thereof something which was ignored from the second caliph's term on, so previous statistics was utilized in this regard. His agents were levying tax even on palm trees and this incurred lots of damages on the people who were paying tax while looking down on them. He also was taking both their offerings and whatever they gave him on such occasions as "New year as well as Mihrgān festivals and land tax was paid based on the latest area being measured by Ibn Hubayra.[4] In Yemen, despite 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz's command to eliminate former severety being exerted by Ḥadjdjādj's brother, once 'Umar came to power, everything went back to its former states and he declared that they would not be forgiven as long as they were alive.[5]

The outcomes of such severety in Yazīd's term were worse in Khurāsān in the eastern parts of which there were many governors as well as kings who each had embraced Islam on their domains and agreed to pay tax. Among them, Sughdiyān who were numerous were held to be a great supporter for Muslim Arabs who were residing there and fighting with Turks settling in Transoxania. Re-imposing prior fiscal pressure in Yazīd's term was the major cause of their inclination to Turks with assistance of whom they managed to stand against Muslims in 102 A.H.. In clashes between "Sa'īd Khuzayna", Khurāsān governor, and Turks, on one hand, and a group of Sughdiyān, on the other hand, taking place concurrently, both Turks and Sughdiyān were defeated.

At Sa'īd's behest, Muslim forces stopped chasing them inasmuch as فان السغد بستان امیر المومنین "Sughd is flower garden of Amīr al-Mu'minīn."

---

[1]. al-Kharādj, p.131

[2]. An Iranian woolen garment that was used by the learned and nobles

[3]. 'Uyūn al-akhbār, vol.1, p.53

[4]. Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.2, p. 313

[5]. al-Nudjūm al-zāhira, vol.1, p.239

Then he added, "We do not intend to force them to leave this area." Even subsequent to a minor skirmish Sa'īd's herald once again put emphasis on what he had said.[1] Following Sa'īd's displacement, "Sa'īd Ibn 'Amr al-Ḥarathī" became Khurāsān's governor. Feeling insecure due to Arab's presence there, Sughdiyān migrated to "Farghāna" and were settled there by the king of that land. Sughdiyān were so important to Arabs that Iraq's governor, Ibn Hubayra, called upon them to go back to their former residence. Then he would single out whosoever they want as their ruler but they avoided doing so. From then on, clashes between Arabs and Turks, on one hand, and Sughdiyān, on the other hand, escalated [2]; as a result, the east of Khurāsān was no longer secure for Arabs. Later on, once Naṣr Ibn Sayyār was designated as Khurāsān's governor, he received hard conditions on the part of Sughdiyān and reconciled with them.[3]

It can be inferred from what Mas'ūdī had mentioned that Yazīd, considering his personality, was a man after libidinous pleasures and womanizing. Being in love with a woman, he kept her corpse several days after her death.[4] Suppressing Yazīd's revolt, Maslama Ibn 'Abd al-Malik came to power but after a while he was dismissed owing to the fact that he had avoided paying tax. Subsequently, 'Umar Ibn Hubayra, one of the rigid governors of Umayyads in Iraq took his place.

YAZĪD IBN MUHALLAB'S UPRISING

During the last thirty years of Umayyads caliphate several uprisings came about each of which had originated from various regions with various objectives. From among those individuals and groups taking advantage of the outcomes of such riots were opportunists such as Yazīd Ibn Muhallab, justice-seekers such as Ḥārith Ibn Suraydj, Khāridjites, the 'Abbāsids as well as Zayd Ibn 'Alī and his son, Yaḥyā, from among 'Alawites.

In 102, Yazīd Ibn Muhallab, the son of Muhallab Ibn Abī Ṣafra and a member of Azd tribe whose fame was thanks to his battles against Khāridjites during 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr and 'Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwān's term, was nominated as Khurāsān's governor. He had some conquests not only there but also in Gurgān. Owing to the fact that he had refused to hand over war spoils in his possession, once 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz took office,

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol. 5, p. 355

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol. 5, pp. 362-366

[3]. Ibid. vol.v, p.508

[4]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.3, pp.198-199; Tārīkh Gudhīdih, p.283; Tārīkh Mukhtaṣar al-duwal, pp.115-116

he was imprisoned.[1] He was still there when Yazīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik came to power and was apprehensive of being killed accordingly, so he escaped to Iraq. The governor of Baṣra, 'Adī Ibn Arṭāt at Yazīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik's behest, put his family under lock and key. Resorting to a proper policy, Yazīd Ibn Muhallab managed to attract not only some tribes to himself but three thousand people as well by displaying his generosity to them.[2] In a clash between 'Adī Ibn Arṭāt and some of the people of Baṣra and Damascus residing there, on one hand, and Yazīd Ibn Muhallab on the other hand, the Umayyads's army was defeated and Baṣra went under Yazīd's domination.[3] Subsequently, the same happened to some other eastern cities such as Ahwāz, Kirmān, Makrān, Sind and Hind as well. He designated a governor for each; nevertheless, in the west the army of Damascus termed as "Allāh's soldiers"[4] by the Umayyads was threatening Iraqi rebels and prior experiences also endorsed it since they had been defeated by them and this time, the same happened.

The residents of Baṣra being free form Umayyads's mischief paid allegiance to Yazīd, who had promised to follow Qur'ān and the prophets Sunna, and stipulated that he should not bring back conduct of Ḥadjdjādj, the wrong-doer.[5] Yazīd told the people that fighting against the Umayyads was worthier than waging war against unbelievers and a courageous army.[6]

It was obvious to some of the residents of Baṣra that Yazīd Ibn Muhallab was still attached to the Umayyads. Being ruthless toward people just the same as them, he pretended that he was adherent to Qur'ān as well as the prophet's Sunna once he recognized his interests were at risk. From among those individuals Ḥasan Baṣrī was the one stimulating others to leave off bolstering him saying that it was Yazīd who was joining hands with the Umayyads in public oppression.[7]

In response people said, "He is calling us for following 'Umarayn tradition."

They asked Ḥasan Baṣrī why he was supporting the wrongdoers of Damascus who had destroyed sacred House of God and his prophet in addition to liquidating the residents of Medina during three days.[8] Keeping

---

[1]. Al-Tanbīh wa l-ishrāf, p.277

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p. 3

[3]. Ibid. vol.8, p. 5

[4]. Ibid. vol.8, pp.7, 21

[5]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.335; See, al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.8

[6]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.335

[7]. Ibid. vol.5, p.336

[8]. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.9

silent as long as Yazīd Ibn Muhallab was in Baṣra, Ḥasan Baṣrī launched his propagation once again upon Yazīd's departure from Baṣra to confront a dispatched army from Damascus. His position in Baṣra forced some of his supporters to give up backing Yazīd. Marwān Ibn Muhallab, Yazīd's brother and his successor said of him that he could only attract some of ignoble residents of Uballa and 'Alwadj in Baṣra who were most likely referred to non-Arabs. Upon hearing this, people made up their minds to war with the alm of supporting Ḥasan Baṣrī but he prevented them form doing so.[1]

Considering this threat a serious one, Yazīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik sent Maslama Ibn 'Abd al-Malik, who was leading the commander of confrontations between Muslim Arabs and Romans, along with a corps to Iraq. Being undecided how to fight with him, Ibn Muhallab sought advice from his backers. Some were of the opinion that they advance eastward and settle on the course connecting Fārs with Khurāsān's mountains. Doing so, they would be secured and some will join them too. Another suggestion was that they go to Mūṣil[2], but Yazīd did not accept it. The army of Damascus nearly consisted of fifty thousand soldiers but for Yazīd Ibn Muhallab it was insignificant.

Describing them, he told, "Most of them were from Djarādjima, Saqāliba, Anbāṭ, Djarāmiqa and other tribes being all either farmers or ruffians.[3] Considering the point being quoted from his brother about 'Alwadj in Baṣra, this shows that Yazīd's measure was of Arabic aspect and even aristocratic and he took no effort to use Mawālī.

At the early stages of the war, compromise was proposed to Yazīd but he preferred to fight. This war terminated while it left three thousand killed. From among them were Yazīd and four brothers of him as well.[4] The majority of captives of Baṣra, who themselves uncovered that by being remiss in that war they had paved the ground for the victory of the army of Damascus, were also slaughtered.[5] This came about in Ṣafar, 102 A.H. in 'Aqr nearby Kūfa which later came to be known as Yawm al-'Aqr, "Day of 'Aqr". The remainder of Ibn Muhallab's family ran away from Baṣra. Going eastward, they confronted with the army of Damascus, then they were massacred all in Qandābīl in India. In that clash Iraqis such as Nu'mān Ibn

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.8, p.14; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.341

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.337; al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.13

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.14

[4]. Ibid. vol.8, p.19

[5]. Ibid. vol.8, pp.20-22

Ibrāhīm Ibn Ashtar as well as Muḥammad Ibn Isḥāq Ibn Ash'ath were also killed.[1]

One further point which should be taken into consideration is that almost all of the Umayyads's rulers were doomed either to be at the head of the government or in jail, the latter of whom were slaughtered most of the time. Once Yazīd Ibn Muhallab was asked why he did not build a house for himself.

What he said in reply was that, "My domicile is either a royal palace or prison."[2] In all likelihood, he could not imagine that the grave was his third choice.

From among the poets supporting him indirectly was "Thābit Quṭna", celebrated poet who was among the Murdji'ites. He also had a hand in some conquests in the east where he incited people to back up Yazīd Ibn Muhallab. Abu l-Faradj Iṣfahānī considered him a Murdji'ites in his brief biography. In a poem, he has praised and has induced him to war with the Umayyads.[3] Later on, when Yazīd was defeated, in a poem he reproached those leaving him alone.[4]

On the whole what can be said about Yazīd Ibn Muhallab and his riot is that he was an opportunist going on the rampage after years of oppressing people merely because he was disfavored by the Umayyads. People who were tired of the Umayyads's cruelties and contemptuous attitude of the residents of Damascus toward Iraqis in particular were supporting him for a while despite the fact that they were not serious enough in that. That was why they could not be victorious.

In describing Yazīd Ibn Muhallab's riot, it is importuned to refer to another uprising in Africa. Ṭabarī was quoted as saying that Yazīd Ibn Abī Muslim wanted to adopt the style of Ḥadjdjādj Ibn Yūsuf Thaqafī in Iraq in collecting tribute form the newly converted ones who were paying it prior to embracing Islam. Preventing him from following such policy, people put him to death. At the same time, they did not overlook the Umayyads domination and singled out Muḥammad Ibn Yazīd al-Anṣārī, their former governor, as their ruler and wrote a letter to Yazīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik saying that they did not disobey him. In response, he mentioned that he was not gratified with what Yazīd Ibn Abī Muslim had done but he was pleased with Muḥammad Ibn Yazīd.[5] It is worth saying that Yazīd Ibn Abī Muslim was

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.8, p.24

[2]. 'Uyūn al-akhbār, vol.1, pp.233, 312

[3]. al-Aghānī, vol.14, pp.277-278

[4]. al-Aghānī, vol.14, p.279

[5]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.359; al-Kāmil fi l-tārikh, vol.v, p.101

Ḥadjdjādj's scribe formerly. Emulating him, he desired to put his policy into practice.[1]

HISHĀM IBN 'ABD AL-MALIK'S SUCCESSION

In Shawwāl, 105 A.H., Hishām took the place of his brother and until the year 125, he was in the some position for about nineteen years and seven months. It was he who presided over one of the splendid and durable administrations of the Umayyads's dynasty. Mas'ūdī described some specifications of him in particular his interest in horses.[2] As Ya'qūbī mentioned, he was renowned by such attributes as prudence, intelligence, stinginess, jealousy, harshness and so forth.[3]

Dhahabī also described him by stating, فيه ظلم مع عدل[4] "He was both cruel and just."

He also had quoted some others as saying that he strongly disliked bloodshed.[5] It is probable that for the very same reason he had ordered to suppress "Zayd Ibn 'Alī's" riot.

'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Alī, someone who had chased the remainder of the Umayyads's corps and killed Marwān Ibn Muḥammad, was quoted as saying, "I collected the chanceries of the Marwānids but none was as systematic as that of Hishām's."[6]

He was preventing the Marwānids from taking bounty out of public treasury excluding the time when they could either participate in war themselves or send someone else on their behalf.[7] There is a quotation from Ṭabarī stating that how Hishām was rebuking his son for his non-attendance in Friday prayers.[8] Just in the same way Sa'īd dismissed his son, the governor of Ḥimṣ because of adultery.[9] On the other hand, Iṣfahānī had touched on the ways Hishām treated Walīd Ibn Yazīd, his lewd successor, and vice versa – the account of ewhich will be given at a later time. These are all definite indications that Hishām was a wine drinker too as well as

---

[1]. See, Nudjūm al-zāhira, vol.1, p.245

[2]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.205, See, Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, pp 515-520; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.v, p.192, about his interest in wearing clothes.

[3]. Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.2, p.328

[4]. Siyar a'lām al-nubalā', vol.v, p.352

[5]. Ibid.

[6]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.516

[7]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.515

[8]. Ibid. vol.v, p.516

[9]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.v, p.195

being trapped by lewd companions[1] promoting people to bolster Yazīd. Some other quotations indicate that Hishām was following the same route as Zuhrī, an eminent traditionalist and linked to the Umayyads, or possibly others were lending a helping hand in assassinating those who were after bullyism. As a case in point, Djahm Ibn Ṣafwān's murder can be mentioned. In a letter found later in Hishām's records, it is read that he had called upon Naṣr Ibn Sayyār, Khurāsān's governor, to search for someone coming from Dahrīs to that area and kill him.[2] Somewhere else we will comment on Djahm as well as "Ghaylān Dimashqī" both being murdered by 'Abd al-Malik in 119 A.H.[3]

Apart from Zuhrī who was much adored by Hishām, other traditionists such as Manṣūr Ibn Mu'tamir were attracted by him.[4] Abu l-Zanād was also an scribe of the Umayyads.[5] Zayd Ibn 'Alī's riot was a momentous incident in Hishām's term which will be discussed in more detail later.

Khālid Ibn 'Abd Allāh Qasrī, an outstanding governor of Hishām in Iraq, reigned there from the very early stages of his caliphate for almost twenty years. To some, he was similar to a bunch of governors as Ziyād Ibn Abīh and Ḥadjdjādj.[6] This was not an extremist view. Just as Ḥadjdjādj, Khālid was trustworthy and utterly loyal to the Umayyads. Being furious at him, Hishām refrained from endorsing what his predecessor had stated so that to accuse him of assisting the prophet's Household as well as being an stimulating element in Yazīd's movement.

In response, Hishām said to Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar, "You are not more than a lier and by no means do we accuse him of disobedience."[7] His resemblance to Ḥadjdjādj will be quite apparent once the same utterance of him was said by Khālid. That statement was, "The caliph is superior to prophet."[8]

However later on Khālid bitterly said that some of the supporters of Hishām had said this sentence.

Khālid was quoted as saying, "If, the commander of the believers – Hishām – instructs me to knock down Ka'ba and dispatch every stone thereof to Damascus, I will assuredly do the same".[9]

---

1. al-Aghānī, vol.7, pp.5-6
2. Tārīkh al-Djahmiyya wa l-mu'tazila, p.17
3. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.516
4. al-Iḍāḥ, p.91
5. Siyar a'lām al-nubalā', vol.v, p.449
6. Tārīkh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, p.116
7. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.558
8. al-Aghānī, vol.22, p. 18
9. Ibid. vol.22, pp 16-17

This was another feature bearing comparison with that of Ḥadjdjādj Khālid presided over Iraq, just about the eastern part of the Islamic lands, for almost fifty years at peace. It was Khālid who prevented Yazīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik from ousting his brother and substituting his son, Walīd. That was why Hishām had trusted[1], adored and abided by him for fifty years. In as much as his mother was a Christian, he had built a synagogue for her, accordingly he was charged with propagating "Christianity" and in consequence he was despised severely by some poets. He was held to be responsible for "demolishing mosques, establishing synagogues, having Muslims under Magian's domination and having daughters of Muslims marrying the protected people".[2]

Iṣfahānī declared, "He was a heretic and his mother a Christian one. He had Muslims under Magians and Christians thumb and let them bother Muslims. The protected people were paying for slave girls and had sexual intercourse with them and yet Khālid did not show any objection.[3]

Being imprisoned by him, Farazdaq wrote these verses in his reproach,

أبلغ أمير المؤمنين رسالة فعجّل هداك الله نزعك خالد

بني بيعة فيها الصليب لأمّه وهدم من بغض الإله مساجد[4]

"Hishām! Hasten to transfer this message to the commander of the believers, May God guide you in Khālid's removal, he who dismantled mosques out of his grudge against Allāh and established a synagogue instead. He put a cross therein too."

Referring to the way of his ruling, he vocalized,

وكيف يؤم المسلمين وأمّه تدين بأنّ الله ليس بواحد[5]

How he leads Muslims while on no account is his mother a believer.

Iṣfahānī accused him of having association with heretics.[6] Thinking about his mother as well as his accusations, one should not be surprised upon hearing that he was handling non-Muslims fittingly and in all likelihood he was inclined towards them.

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.2, p.314

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.458

[3]. al-Aghānī, vol.22, p.16

[4]. Ibid. vol.22, p.21

[5]. al-Aghānī, vol.22, p.21

[6]. Ibid. vol.22, p.24

Dealing with the Shi'ite Muslims as well as the Commander of the Believers in a harsh way, Khālid affronted Imām 'Alī (a) so openly and bitterly that it is deplorable to be reiterated. He said that Imām was in the midst of the hell. He was also paying money to people to curse him. Iṣfahānī has a number of quotations in this regard[1] and after mentioning each, he had damned Khālid by stating, لعن الله خالدا ومن والاه قبحهم صلوات الله علي اميرالمؤمنين "May God curse Khālid and his puppet rulers woe betide them."

Khālid was ousted in 120 A.H., the reason of which is hardly relevant to our discussion but as mentioned primarily it was owing to the fact that Hishām was emulating Khālid in cereal production whose increase was a threat to his profits.[2] Being dismissed, he headed for Damascus while he was tortured by Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar for a while just in the same way he had treated 'Umar Ibn Hubayra once he came to power. In Damascus too, he was subject to Hishām's persecution. When Walīd Ibn Yazīd took office, he handed him over to Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar By taking considerable amount of money, then, he killed Khālid. Later on, one of his offsprings took the life of his father's murderer in Yazīd Ibn Walīd's jail.[3]

The prime reason that enabled Khālid to be the governor of Iraq as well as the eastern parts of Islamic lands for over fifty tears was a special privilege devoted to him in return for his total adherence to the Umayyads's demands. From among them, one was absolute savagery, an one of his outstanding attributes, accordingly he was labeled as "anti-truth tyrant".[4] Another one was hostility towards "'Alī's lineage" which was notable in him as well. He was so strongly loyal to the Umayyads that individuals such as Yazīd Ibn Muhallab were not comparable to him because once they became powerful, they thought that they were independent.

KHĀRIDJITES' REBELLION IN TIME OF THE MARWĀNIDS

An interval between 60s and up to late 70s, known as "Al-Shurāt" by the narrators thereof, was considered to be a crucial period of Khāridjites' activities, although they did remain in power and fought against the 'Alawites and the Umayyads thereafter. The leading centers for their activities were Baṣra and Kūfa's suburbs. Being driven out from there, they settled down in Fārs, Kirmān, Khūzistān and Sīstān. What is more is that their settlement in each region was a transient one so they were almost always relocating. They managed to fortify themselves remarkably in a

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.22, pp.15-18

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.468

[3]. See, Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, pp.541,543, 559-561

[4]. See, Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, pp. 463-464

period between Yazīd's death in 64 A.H. and subsequent ineffectuality of the Umayyads in Iraq up to the time it was conquered by 'Abd al-Malik. Khāridjites's advancement was mainly due to the Zubayrids's leniency for some years to such an extent that in 68 A.H. they could freely pay for pilgrimage in Mecca.[1]

Subsequent to Mu'āwiya's death and Karbalā's event while 'Ubayd Allāh was reigning over Iraq, Mirdās Ibn Udayya from Khāridjites ran wild and was at a later time murdered by 'Ubayd Allāh.[2] Confronting a great number of Khāridjites in Iraq, 'Ubayd Allāh started demonstrating harsh treatment. He himself divulged that the worthiest action of him after believing in Allāh's Unity was assassinating the Khāridjites.[3] Prior to deciding on a caliph for Damascus, he was shouldering this task subsequent to Yazīd's death during which he was capturing those under suspicion. He termed that action, later on, as one of his significant undertakings.[4] The relatives of those who were seized implored him to set them free and he, due to his unsatisfactory situation, admitted it; as a result, Khāridjites were given more freedom. When he escaped to Damascus, there was no longer any obstacle before them. During Ibn Ziyād's ruling over Iraq, as it was quoted by Ibn Qutayba, he was searching for Khāridjites under suspicion and after their apprehension he took their lives.[5]

What has been disclosed considering Ziyād and his son, 'Ubayd Allāh, is that they shed the blood of at least 13000 of them.[6] Exerting such pressure obliged some of the Khāridjites to run away to Mecca that was under 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr's control who not only had cordial relationship with them but struggled diligently to take advantage of them in the Umayyads's confrontation as well. Thus, Khāridjites who felt secure enough, then joined Ibn Zubayr. To justify what they had done, they proposed the idea of "defending the Sacred Territory of Allāh".[7] Being adherent to 'Uthmān, Ibn Zubayr provoked his father strongly in Djamal war that started in revenge for 'Uthmān's murder who was severely despised by Khāridjites. The sole reason for Khāridjites to join Ibn Zubayr was their common interests.

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.4, p.515; Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.2, p.263

[2]. al-'Arāq fī l-'Aṣr al-umawī, p.230

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.4, p.109

[4]. Ibid. vol.4, p.116

[5]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa

[6]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.4, p.403

[7]. Ibid. vol.4, p.436; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol. 4, p.58

Ibn Zubayr was quated as saying, لو أعاني الشيطان علي أهل الشام لقبلته[1] "Even if Satan protects me against the residents of Damascus, I would accept his help."

Once Yazīd's corps left Mecca upon hearing the news of his death, Khāridjites went to Ibn Zubayr to inquire about his opinion regarding 'Uthmān. Recognizing that he was loyal to 'Uthmān left him alone.

Apart from those Khāridjites being conducted by Nāfi' Ibn Azraq, the founder of Azāriqa, another group also shaped up in Yamāma, Baḥrayn, 'Ummān and Ḥadjar under the leadership of Nadjda Ibn 'Āmīr Ḥanafī subsequent to Imām Ḥusayn's martyrdom. In 68 A.H., it was Nadjda who supervised the pilgrimage service for Khāridjites but for one reason or another, he did not cooperate with Nāfi' so he was dismissed by them. Then, Abū Fudayk substituted him and was killed after a while.[2]

The Zubayrids's leniency in Iraq was a justification for Khāridjites under the leadership of Nāfi' Ibn Azraq (killed in 65 A.H.) to put the residents of Baṣra in a great inconvenience so as to block the way to commercial caravans in the east and northeast thereof. Going out of patience, Baṣra's occupants considered Khāridjites's threat a serious one and prepared to fight them. After a slight clash which was not a victorious one for them eventually, they, along with Muhallab Ibn Abī Ṣafra, whose reputation was due to his continual assaults on Khāridjites for extensive periods, launched an attack on them. Fiscal support of Baṣra's merchants[3] for Muhallab who was singled out as governor by 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr could suppress them for a while. In spite of the fact that they were not abundant in number in contrast with Iraqis, Khāridjites managed to resist them.

Muhallab in this regard said, سبحان الله العظيم ما رأيت ولاسمعت بمثل هولاء القوم ساعة قط كلما ينقص منهم أن يزيد فيهم[4] "On no account had I seen or heard of such a tribe; the more they decrease in number, it seems the more they increase."

In clashes of this kind, they repeatedly retreated while they left too many forces dead each time. Once they were chased up to Iṣfahān then they entered Fārs and camped in Arradjān while they were over thirty two thousand.[5] Apparently, the majority of those joining them were Iranians opposing the Umayyads. These clashed extended to Ahwāz and Nubanddjān of Fārs as well. After a while, Ibn Ma'mar substituted commander of Iraqis

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.4, p.94; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.v, p. 131

[2]. See, Tārīkh al-Ya'qubī, vol.2, p.273; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.4, p. 267

[3]. al-Kāmil fī l-adab, vol.3, p. 312; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.4, pp.146,181

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.7, p.44

[5]. Ibid. vol.6, p.19

army but his continual defeats[1] verified that no one can make this war a victorious one but Muhallab. Accordingly, once again he was designated as .commander by Ibn Zubayr. The Zubayrids were over thrown while the Umayyads still needed Muhallab and he had been fighting the Khāridjites for nearly three years or so subsequent to Iraq's conquest. Then, they were divided into branches not because of military failure but due to serious discrepancies among themselves. As a result, they were defeated.

Qaṭarī Ibn Fudjā'a became their commander once Nāfi' Ibn Azraq was killed in a clash in Ahwāz. Opposing some of the Khāridjites in Kirmān, he departed to Ṭabaristān and was murdered there.[2] Two other groups, one under the leadership of Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, the senior and the other Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, the junior fought separately and both were beaten. Prior to this, Muhallab had informed Ḥadjdjādj that one and the only way to overcome the Khāridjites was creating tension among them.[3]

The Azāriqa were still there, that Shabīb Khāridjī, a valorous one from the Khāridjites, started combating Ḥadjdjādj. From 76 A.H. on, he defeated the army of Iraq several times and conquered Kūfa twice while in both cases, Ḥadjdjādj concealed himself in his palace. He made some linked individuals to the Umayyads such as Abū Burda, the son of Abū Mūsā Ash'arī pay allegiance to him.[4] At that time, only the army of Damascus contributed to him.

Ḥadjdjādj himself made it known to 'Abd al-Malik, وقد عجز أهل الكوفه عن قتال شبيب في مواطن كثيرة في كل بقتل أمراءهم[5] "Kūfiyāns were incapable of fighting Shabīb in verious instances, in each of which their leaders were killed."

This was in contrast with what Ḥadjdjādj had done to Iraqis, that is pressurizing and mobilizing them against the Khāridjites by force.[6] Once he gave them three days to attack the Khāridjites led by Muhallab. To prevent others from disobeying him, he killed an aged man regardless of his acceptable reasons for not going to war.[7]

Despite frequent vanquishments as well as losses that were imposed on them during several years, the Khāridjites managed to save themselves from annihilation; nevertheless, considering their achievements of their aims, one should say they were not triumphant since they were fighting to overpower

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.6, p.31-46

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, pp.125-126

[3]. Ibid. vol.v, pp.121-122; Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.2, p.276

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.77

[5]. Ibid. vol.v, p.85

[6]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.130

[7]. al-Kāmil fi l-adab, vol.2, p.212l; al-Aghānī, vol.l4, p.244

the Umayyads and by no means could they accomplish it. Whenever they were united, soon they dispersed due to their enemy's assault. Therefore, it can be inferred that they were both victorious in that they protected themselves and defeated in achieving their objectives. The reasons of both cases should be determined. From among factors contributing to their survival, possible repelling of their enemy's invasion as well as suppressing their opponents which enabled them to exercise influence on people [1] was their partisan wars in which they were routing their enemies swiftly before they could prepare themselves. They not only shocked their enemy but destroyed them as well.[2] They uprooted their adversaries by taking advantage of internal elements and those selected as the Khāridjites's executioners by governors were not secure from their revenge. To give an example, once they could not kill the murderer, they killed his camel instead.[3] Sometimes, they succeeded in taking their lives.[4]

Ibn Ziyād disclosed that, ما أدري كيف اصنع ما أقتل رجلا من هذه المارقة الا قتل قاتله [5] "I know not what to do, I kill none of the Khāridjites save they also killed the spies giving information about the Khāridjites to governors."[6]

Fighting against Ḥadjdjādj who was infamous, the Khāridjites could somehow achieve fame. Being a dictator who was distinguished for his corruption, Ḥadjdjādj did not refrain from oppressing people and it was a typical feature of all Umayyads that the Khāridjites were taking advantage of in provoking people both against them and themselves[7] and even obliging some pious people to follow them. From among them, one can name Ṣāliḥ Ibn Masraḥ who, due to existing oppression, told his followers, متي انتم مقيمون هذا الجور قد فشا وهذا العدل قد عفي ولاتزداد هذه الولاة علي الناس الا علواً وعتواً وتباعداً عن الحق وجرأة علي الرب "As long as you stay in power, cruelty runs, the justice disappears and the rulers foment bullying and domination as well as they are abstentious against the truth" and that was why the Khāridjites did ask him to join them. He ran wild in 76 A.H. and was killed later. Then Shabīb who was from Khāridjites replaced him.[8]

---

[1]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.v, p.83

[2]. al-ḥayawān, vol.I, from page 41on

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.4, p.19

[4]. Ibid. pp.91-92

[5]. Ibid. p.91

[6]. Ibid. p.94

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.4, p.19

[8]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.56

Another one leading man of Khāridjites was ʻAbd Allāh Ibn Yaḥyā who was told as saying, فرآى باليمن جوراً ظاهراً وعسفاً شديداً وسيرة في الناس قبيحة "There, I did observe apparent injustice an unpleasant behavior towards people."

Accordingly, for the very same reason he assembled his supporters and by saying, لا يحل لنا المقام علي مانري ولا الصبر عليه "Beholding these things, hesitation shall fly away he went on a rampage."[1]

Abū Ḥamza Khāridjī in his speech in 12 A.H. also touched upon governor's cruelty as a stimulus factor [2] and it is quite obvious that the idea of combating cruelty could attract attention considerably.

Inasmuch as Iran was the major center for their operations, a great number of Mawālī joined them in spite of the fact that it was not the case for all Khāridjites' parties. This was a crucial advantage for them since Iranians were valorous enough to battle.

As it was told, الموالي أشجع الخوارج وأشدهم جسارة[3] "Khāridjites, as Muhallab was informed, were mainly blacksmiths, dyers, butchers, etc."[4] These people from the middle social strata, were naturally acceding to style of the Khāridjites since they were under hard pressure. Additionally, Khāridjites' fame for their piety[5] was an outstanding factor for them to absorb people. Some of them even were considered ascetics.[6]

People's apprehension of them was another element assisting them in particular as regards to those tribes as well as the residents of some cities who were doing so to protect their children and themselves since they were not secure from their attack. Here, one should point out that the very element was also one of the major hurdles in the way of their progress. Although people were contributing to the Khāridjites fearing their lives, they gradually turned to the Umayyads and assisted them to get rid of the Khāridjites who

---

[1]. al-Aghānī, vol.20, p.97, vol.6, p.149; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.v, p.106

[2]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.v, p.114, See, also pp.117,118,119

[3]. Tarīkh al-yaʻqūbī, vol.2, p.262; al-Kāmil fī l-tārīkh, vol.3, p.373

[4]. al-Kāmil fī l-adab, vol.3, p.314; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.4, p.147

[5]. The credibility of this statement is subject to debate since, for instance, there is a quotation about Shabīb regarding his intention of joing the Khāridjites indicating that he was a financial motive. ʻAllāma Djaʻfar Murtaḍā also remained dubious about their asceticism. In his book which has not published yet, there is a chapter under the title of "al-Khāridjites Ṭāmiʻūn am Zuhhād" in which he touched upon this despite the fact that some of which are not quite valid. In addition, there have been several quotations indicating their piety in their personal lives which were not written in that book. Undoubtedly, regarding those things what the writer has said seemed quite true.

[6]. al-Kāmil fī l-adab, vol.II, p.149; al-ʻarāq fī l-ʼaṣr al-umawī, pp.227,230; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.4, p.89; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.v, p.106

were hard-hearted in their views. The merchants of Baṣra and probably other areas who deemed the Khāridjites as a great threat to their interests backed them openly.

The Khāridjites frankness always made them lose their heads. Banning precaution dissimulation by the Azāriqa forced Khāridjī Azraqī to disobey them in any form and under any circumstances. Then, he, along with fifty or a hundred soldiers, set off untimely and irregular riots which led to their defeat. In contrast, the Shi'ite Muslims succeeded in setting themselves free from the Umayyads' mischief by observing the very precautionary dissimulation.

Prevailing Islam in Iraq especially in Kūfa was an obstacle to Khāridjites's domination. It has been said that the Shi'ite Muslims whose Imām was martyred by Khāridjites had strong spite towards them and the Umayyads did take advantage of such feeling greatly and that was why the Khāridjites residing in Kūfa were not as many as those in Baṣra.[1]

THE FOUNDATION OF THE KHĀRIDJITES' PRINCIPLES

In formation of various sects most of the time the main controversial issue would later on become the central belief of that sect. At times, even the name of that sect would be derived thereof in spite of the fact that occasionally the names of the leaders of sects would go back to them. In Khāridjites' case, the name of their sect originated from their effort to revolt against the Commander of the Believers and their endeavor in excommunicating both 'Alī (a) and 'Uthmān was the leading belief of their sect. In fact, discussion about faith versus disbelief was an important point over which different parties debated and became somehow problematic for early sects. With reference to this, 'Uthmān and the companions of Djamal were measured, then, it was turn of the residents of Damascus. Once Iraqis fought against Damascus people, knowing that they were infidels but confronting Arbitration, they hesitated about continuing the war. To eliminate this, they would rather believe in what the opponents had accepted to such an extent that they described Imām 'Alī (a) as infidel since he had endorsed Arbitration. One further point was that if someone were disbeliever due to advocating Arbitration which was considered as a cardinal sin, then what would happen to others committing cardinal sins? Based on the same extremist view which was the main reason of their defeat, they labeled them as unbelievers. It is known that Mu'tazila had termed those committing cardinal sins neither as a Muslim wrongdoer nor pious or infidel but purely as a wrongdoer. In contrast, in Imāmiyya whoever testifies that there is no

---

[1]. al-'arāq fi l-'aṣr al-umawī, p.242

God besides Allāh and Muḥammad is the Allāh's Prophet is Muslim and is entitled to enjoy the same rights as Muslims accordingly. Considering the doer of cardinal sin one should apply the term Muslim wrongdoer (not wrong-doer alone).

In this regard, Shahristānī stated that, "All of them are of the opinion that despising 'Alī (a) as well as 'Uthmān is a must. Considering this issue of prime importance they did hold their marriages to be true merely when they were based on this belief."[1]

The dispute over belief versus disbelief regarding Imām 'Alī (a) and 'Uthmān from then on turned out to be the main principle for Khāridjites and the other one was showing resistance to rulers whenever they disregard Sunna.[2]

The Azāriqa who was active during that time was one the most extremist groups of Khāridjites who considered those men, women and even children not being a member of the group as infidel and doomed to death.[3]

They referred to this verses,

وَقَالَ نُوحٌ رَبِّ لَا تَذَرْ عَلَى الْأَرْضِ مِنَ الْكَافِرِينَ دَيَّارًا. إِنَّكَ إِنْ تَذَرْهُمْ يُضِلُّوا عِبَادَكَ وَلَا يَلِدُوا إِلَّا فَاجِرًا كَفَّارًا.[4]

"And Noah said, "My Lord! Leave me not one of the disbelievers in the land. If you leave them, they will mislead the slaves and will beget none save lewd ingrates"

Moderate followers of the Azāriqa such as Ṣufriyya sect were obtaining from killing children. Banning "Taqiyya" was one of the fundamental principles of the Azāriqa over which they had discrepancy with the Khāridjites form Yamāma and ultimately, it led them to be separated form Nadjda Ḥarūrī.[5]

Moreover, books concerning sects as well as scholastic theology and jurisprudence compiled by their opponents were attributed to them. The Khāridjites who were dispersed due to continual wars and were secluded from Muslims' scientific centers, as a result, less commented on this. Other than the Abāḍiyya that still has some followers in 'Ummān and North of Africa, all other sects have swept out and it is very difficult to confirm the credibility of the principles attributed to them. In addition, another feature of them was altering their principles. It seems as if the Abāḍiyya were dubious

---

[1]. al-Milal wa l-niḥal, vol.1, p.106; Tabṣirat al-'awām, p.46

[2]. al-Milal wa l-niḥal, vol.1, p.106

[3]. Ibid. vol.1, pp.109,140; al-Aghānī, vol.6, p.142

[4]. Nūḥ, 26,27

[5]. al-Milal wa l-niḥal, vol.1, p.112

whether to renounce 'Alī (a) or not and in the latest scripts of some of them they expressed their devotion to 'Alī (a).

Since some books of various sects were at odds with principles of Khāridjites, there has been exaggeration about basic principles of them. Inasmuch as Khāridjites were mainly composed of Mawālī, they made up a new theory overlooking a condition for Imamate e namely being a member of Quraysh, a principle which the Sunnites strongly upheld over six hundred years later.[1] Some Arab tribes bolstering Khāridjites probably had endorsed this principle either because they did not value caliphate, which was independent from tribal power or they did this to compete with Quraysh.

Yazīdiyya, one of the Khāridjites sects that, according to a few fragmented Jarudites, had extremist Khāridjites beliefs about non-Arabism thought, سيبعث الله رسولاً من العجم ويترل عليه كتابا قد كتبت في السماء ويترك شريعة محمداً المصطفي [2] It should be mentioned that Qur'ān was revealed in the second century A.H. as a result, the Khāridjites must have been following other sects in this regard. Anyway, some ideas of Mu'tazilites can be traced back in the Khāridjites' ideologies.

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.1, p.107

[2]. Tabṣirat al-'awām, p.41; al-Milal wa l-niḥal, vol.I, p.122

CHAPTER XI
SHI'ITE MUSLIMS IN THE LAST DECADES OF THE UMAYYAD STATE

THE SHI'ITE MUSLIMS UNDER THE PRESSURE OF THE UMAYYADS

As previously mentioned, Umayyads had three obstinate foes, namely Khāridjites who were of great trouble to them during various periods. Shi'ite Muslims who were in opposition to Mu'āwiya from 'Alī's term on and thereafter Imām Ḥusayn (a), the penitents, Mukhtār, Zayd Ibn 'Alī and Yaḥyā Ibn Yazīd ran wild against them. Moreover, Shi'ites's ideology especially its political aspect based on which the 'Alawites authority was a lawful one operated as an effective trend in the society producing a great threat to the Umayyads. In reality, subsequent to their eradication, Shi'ite Muslims were the Umayyads's successor and ultimately the third group was Iraqi people who regardless of their religion, went on the rampage against them since the treatment of Damascus towards them which probably stemmed from tribal or regional prejudice was a contemptuous one. In spite of the fact that such movements someTimes had leaders or some supporters who had good will, most of the time they covering their objectives as well as reviving the Prophet's Sunna as well as social justice.

Although all of those groups were threatening the Umayyads, the two first groups were more threatening. It is known that the Khāridjites at last could subjugate them in Iraq, then some of those so-called Shi'ite Muslims opportunistically overthrew the and came to power themselves. The Umayyads was striving hard to confine Shi'ite Muslims by any means to prevent them from increasing their influence.

Formerly, we touched upon how the Umayyads bothered the 'Alawites. Now, by bringing some examples, matter is elucidated. During the Umayyads' rule excluding a short time during 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz,[1] they insulted Imām 'Alī (a). From among them one can name Khālid Ibn 'Abd Allāh Qasrī who did the same while being on the pulpit[2] as well as

---

[1]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.v, p.393-394

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.487

describing him in the most biting way.[1] And as one would expect to justify what he had done, he urged some traditionalists to vilify him. For the very same reason, Hishām Ibn 'Abd al-Malik wrote a letter to A'mash, a so-colled Shi'ites in Kūfa and called upon him to compile a book about 'Uthmān's virtues and Imām 'Alī's wrongdoings but he refrained from doing so[2] while such individuals as Zuhrī did never hesitated to do this.

Since he had heard 'Alī (a) was using henna for dying his beard, he quoted from Torah, "Whosoever dyes his beard black is cursed". [3]

The Umayyads' agents used abusive words towards 'Alī's family throughout the Islamic land [4] to taint their reputation and eliminate them from political as well as intellectual scene by rendering the worst accusations against them. That was why harsh treatment in damning 'Alī was quite justified for them. Once Ḥadjdjādj asked his governor in Fārs to make 'Aṭiyya Ibn Sa'd damn 'Alī (a) and if avoided doing so, he should be whipped four hundred times and be shaved as punishment. They did this as Ḥadjdjādj had ordered.[5] Some individuals as Ibn Abī Laylā, an Iraqi jurisprudent, was made to curse 'Alī (a) in public.[6]

It was quite common for Mu'āwiya, Abū Bakr as well as 'Umar to fabricate Hadith to crush Shi'ite Muslims who were referred Rāfiḍī extremist and now most of those forged traditions compiled by the Sunnites are at hand.[7]

When Hishām in 106 A.H., the second year of his caliphate, entered Ḥidjāz for Ḥadjdj, Medina's governor, one of 'Uthmān's grand children, by alluding to 'Uthmān's virtues told caliph, "In this region, it is quite common to curse Abū Turāb, now you can follow this custom too".

Hishām in reply said, "Now I am here for Ḥadjdj and do not intend to curse anyone."[8]

This does not mean that Hishām was not a man of cursing others. In contrast all of his deeds revealed his hostility towards the Prophet's Household and their followers. He himself was the murderer of Zayd Ibn

---

[1]. al-Aghānī, vol.22, from p.15 on.

[2]. Shadjarāt al-dhahab, vol.1, p.221

[3]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.I, p.441

[4]. al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn, vol.3, p.221

[5]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.6, p.306

[6]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.2, p.181

[7]. al-Mawḍū'āt, vol.2, p.15, vol.1, p.304

[8]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, pp.484- 485

'Alī and any Shi'ite Muslims and under those circumstances, he probably gave such reply to Sa'īd Ibn 'Abd Allāh for a specific reason.

When Zayd Ibn 'Alī (a) was in Damascus, Hishām shamelessly inquired him about his brother, Imām Ṣādiq (a) and said, مافعل اخوك البقرة In this way, he demonstrated his malice towards him in his insulting question. In response, Zayd said, اسماه رسول الله باقراً وتسميّة البقرة! لقد اختلفتما اذاً[1] "The Messenger of Allāh had called him Bāqir and now you are addressing him in this way."

Then he went on to say Djābir's quotation in which Allāh's Messenger had told him, "Give Imām Bāqir my best regards."

Shi'ite Muslims such as Kumayt Ibn Zayd Asadī, an outstanding Arab poet, were pressurized in various forms. He was imprisoned for his beliefs and, in particular, having Khālid Ibn 'Abd Allāh Qasrī satirizing the Umayyads. Hishām Ibn 'Abd al-Malik demanded Khālid to pull his tongue out of his mouth and hang him from the door of his house.[2]

Filled with terror, Kumayt wore his wife's clothes who had gone to see him in prison, then he tried to escape. Having no way to do so, he took refuge in Maslama Ibn 'Abd al-Malik and finally he could satisfy Hishām and save his life.[3] It was quite obvious that he was a Shi'ites since he was with Imām Bāqir (a) and other Muḥammad's descendants.[4] Also, his Hāshimites followers are the best proof in this regard.

Apart from suppressing Yazīd Ibn 'Alī's uprising, Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar, Iraq's governor from 120-126 A.H. martyred many of Shi'ite Muslims.

According to Ibn A'tham, فقتل يوسف بن عمر من شيعة آل محمد خلقاً كثيراً رحمة الله عليهم[5] "Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar murdered large numbers of Shi'ite Muslims of Muḥammad (s)'s progeny."

In a letter addressing Hishām, Yūsuf divulged the misery of this household arising from ruler's pressure.[6]

Umayyads negative propagation against Shi'ite Muslims, their politico-ideological opponent, forced Sunnis to adopt a bitter stance on them and despite the fact that the Umayyads themselves were affected by Jewish culture, they made Shi'ite Muslims be known like the Jews.[7] Such accusations were in fact reflections of the Umayyads's propagation. His

---

1. 'Uyūn al-akhbār, vol.1, p.212
2. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, pp.82-83
3. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.84
4. Ibid. vol.8, p.95
5. Ibid. vol.8, p.124
6. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.588
7. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.2, p.410

mention of a detailed quotation, Imām Bāqir (a) displays Shi'ite Muslims stance plainly.

"Noone knows what sufferings we, Ahl al-Bayt, experienced from Quraysh's oppression and stance-taking, so did the Shi'ite Muslims. When Allāh's prophet was about to depart this life told us that we were superior to people while the Quraysh who were collaborating with each other divorced this issue and did take advantage of our superiority to come to power. Then, the post of ruling rotated among them up to the time that once again Ahl al-Bayt restored it, but people who had paid allegiance to us disregarded it and launched an attack against us and 'Alī (a) experienced great hardness prior to his martyrdom. Then it was his son's turn and just the same happened to him. Thereafter, we were constantly irritated, deprived of our rights, threatened, murdered and driven out of our homelands to such an extent that neither us nor were our followers secure any longer. Then the liars and deniers of the truth paved the ground for themselves and approached the originators of injustice as well as their agents throughout the Islamic land. After that, they started forging and spreading traditions. They did quote us as saying things which were neither mentioned nor performed by us. They merely intended to sow the seed of hatred in the hearts of individuals. This was a policy being followed subsequent to Imām Ḥasan's martyrdom during Mu'āwiya's term. Limbs were cut off and those eminent were plundered and their houses were destroyed. This situation worsened during 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād's term. Ḥadjdjādj Ibn Yūsuf came to power in Kūfa after him and he did the same to the Shi'ite Muslims. They were so hard pressed that they would rather be called Zindīq or infidels instead of Shi'ite Muslims. In consequence, the so-called pious people fabricated some traditions touching upon the superiority of the previous rulers something which was by no means true in practice. The succeeding traditionalists verified what had been forged by them inasmuch as they were not quoted by a bunch of unfaithful and lying people."[1]

This was what Imām Ṣādiq (a) had stated regarding injustice imposed on Shi'ite Muslims.[2]

INTERNAL EVENTS OF SHI'ITE MUSLIMS

Possibly, there would be no other issue as important as pondering upon the socio-ideological attitude of the Shi'ite Muslims during that time,

---

[1]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.11, p.44; al-imām al-Ṣādiq, Abū Zuhra, pp.111-112

[2]. Somewhere else, cruelties imposed on Ahl Bayt as well as the Shi'ite Muslims have been mentioned. See, Tārīkh tashayyu' dar Irān, pp.38-44

something which should make clear the stance of some groups surviving under the shadow of "Shī'a". Earlier, discussing about 'Alī's Imamate, it had been stated that Imamate was considered as a "Divine Decree" among the companions and the Commander of the Faithful himself had made great attempt to clarify it. Looking into Imām Sadjdjād's viewpoint regarding Imamate, evidence suggested that he considered Imamate as a divine decree and Imām as a person whose obedience is obligatory on behalf of God. Here, it is worth stating internal problems the Shi'ite Muslims were tackling with.

It was quite obvious that Shi'ite Muslims were misled mainly due to their detachment from their Imāms and it was an apparent consequence since neither Imāms nor the Shi'ite Muslims could contact each other directly. In spite of great endeavors being exerted by Imāms, they did not have enough influence on the Shi'ite Muslims in particular those residing in Iraq far from them, let alone those in Khurāsān, to guide them ideologically.

It is requisite to refer to the book entitled "the History of Shi'ism in Iran" overtured by "various forms of Shi'ism" to discern completely what had been mentioned formerly. Here, some points would be referred to either dropped thoroughly or not discussed in detail.

Exaggeration and the Exaggerators

An incident later came to be known as "Exaggeration" in Islamic history, a rooted deviation in Shi'ites internal affairs, did play a major role in distorting their image. This has been discussed in more detail in "History of Shi'ism" but we will touch upon it here too.

This occurrence goes back to 'Alī's time during which there had been two opposite views regarding him, namely the extremist one based on which he was dealt with as if he were an infidel and the opposite one according to which he was exaggerated to such an extent that he was characterized with divine features. In spite of the fact that there are serious discrepancies concerning peculiarities of views which are too complex to be clarified; however, taking historical events in toaccount, one can make certain that these incidents did take place during Imām 'Alī's time. According to some researchers and as said before, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Saba', the initiator of "Exaggeration", was an imaginary person singled out to stain the Shi'ite Muslims' reputation. Denying him, however one should not equate it with disregarding such exaggerations among the Shi'ite Muslims at that time.

What does Exaggeration imply? Its origin goes back to what had been attributed to Imām 'Alī (a) as well as his descendants that is blasphemy according to the Shi'ites doctrine and abundant traditions from Imāms.

To elaborate the meaning, it deems appropriate to suggest a piece of poem from Sayyid Ḥimyarī, a Shi'ite Muslims poet,

قـــوم غلوا في علّي لا أباً لهم وأجشـــــموا أنفساً في حبّه تعبا
قالوا هو الله جل الله خالقنـــــا من أن يكون له ابن او يكون أبا [1]

"Exaggerating about 'Alī (a), some people whose parents may be damned put great pressure on people to adore him saying that he was God and Almighty God was either his father or his son."

A group of those people were expelled to Madā'in by Imām. Being informed about 'Alī's martyrdom, they nullified it.[2] There are diverse quotations concerning Imām's severity on them in history books manipulated based on various inclinations. From among them, we can have the false account of burning as well as regarding them as dualists.[3]

Such ideas were also approved by some so-called Shi'ite Muslims during Imām Ḥasan's time. قيل للحسن بن علي أنّ اُناساً من الشيعة يزعمون أنّ علياً دابة الارض... فقال, كذبوا، أولئك ليس بشيعة، اولئك اعداؤه[4] "Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī was told, "A few Shi'ite Muslims hold the view that 'Alī is a creature on the earth..." He said, "They tell a lie, these people are not Shi'ite Muslims, they are 'Alī's adversaries."

Forgers of tradition probably had quoted wrong traditions from Imāms repeatedly to subjugate and defame them.

Subsequent to Karbalā event when "the penitents" as well as Mukhtār's uprising took place, the viewpoints of the Exaggerators were still prevailing in Iraq. One point needs consideration, as mentioned before Mukhtār was accused of several wrongdoings one of which was Exaggeration. In the same books, various sects in particular "Kīsāniyya", one of the Exaggerators from among Shi'ite Muslims, was given emphasis while being characterized by having so many divisions and principles. Most of them are still widespread among upcoming Exaggerators and attributed to others to defame Shi'ite Muslims as well as their Imāms.

Regardless of veracity of Kīsānnids's exaggerated principles, what can be inferred from Imām Sadjdjād's statements is that some statements identical to those of Jews and Christians about 'Azīz and Jesus Christ were expressed about Ahl al-Bayt.

---

[1]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.2, p.245

[2]. See, Maqtal 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib (a) (Turāthunā Magazine, No.12), p.121

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.2, pp.166,181

[4]. Ibid. vol.2, p.142; Tārikh Dimashq, vol.XXXVIII, p.112 (In footnote of "Ansāb" for the meaning of "Dābbat al-ard", See, Lisān al-'arab, vol.1, p.370, There this term was said to be a sign of the arrival of the Day of Judgement.

Imām Sadjdjād (a) stated, احبّونا حب الاسلام ولاترفعونا فوق حدنا[1] "Love us as well as you do Islam and keep us as high as we are."

Somewhere else he told, إنّ قوماً من شيعتنا سيحبونا حتى يقولوا فينا ما قالت اليهود في عزير وما قالت النصارى في عيسى بن مريم فلا هم منا ولا نحن منهم[2] "Some of our Shi'ite Muslims are so kind- hearted toward us that ascribe what Jews told about 'Azīz and Christians about Christ to us. By no means are we from among them nor do they."

It is worthwhile mentioning that the Exaggerators vocalized Imām Ḥusayn is still alive just the same as Jesus Christ, and As'ad Ibn Ḥanẓala Shāmī was killed instead of him.[3]

Ṭabarī quoted Abī Mikhnaf as saying that there had been some Exaggerators in Kūfa. According to what Ḥaṣīra Ibn 'Abd Allāh had told Abū Mikhnaf in this quotation, from among Shi'ites Exaggerators were "Hind Bint al-Mutakallifa al-Nā'iṭiyya whose house was center of all Shi'ites Exaggerators. The other one was "Laylā Bint Qumāma al-Muzayna who was not loved by his brother Rufā'a, a moderate Shi'ites. Once Ibn Ḥanīfa was informed about their presence in Kūfa, he wrote a letter to Shi'ite Muslims in there urging them to go to mosques and praise Allāh and not to choose their friends from among those who are not pious. If they actually are worried about themselves, they should be pious, cautious of liars, perform prayers while keeping in mind that it is at Allāh's behest for all living beings to be either loser or winner. و كل نفس بما كسبت رهينة، ولاتزر وازرة وزر أخرى والله قائم علي كلّ نفس بما كسبت فاعملوا صالحاً وقدّموا لأنفسكم حسناً ولا تكونوا من الغافلين[4] "Everyone falls responsible for his practice and no one bears sin of others, God beholds one's deeds, so practice righteously, proceed onto virtues and avoid being among the negligent."

As it was touched on before, some historians made every endeavor to define Exaggeration as having some principles much the same as that of the Twelfth Imām Shi'ism to attribute those principles to them but paying just a little attention, one can easily understand that they are forged. In Shi'ites sources as well, some people's stance such as Ibn Ḥanafiyya and Imām's speeches expressed without caution removes any doubt completely.

---

[1]. Ḥilyat al-awliyā', vol.III, p.136

[2]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p.102

[3]. 'Ilal al-sharāyi', pp.225-227; Biḥār al-anwār, v.XXXXIV, pp.269-271

[4]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.4, p.566, 567; I'lām al-nisā', vol.V, p.252

CONFRONTATION OF IMĀMS WITH THE EXAGGERATORS

Shi'ites Imāms openly took a stand against movements of exaggerators, instances of which could be seen during Imām Ṣādiq and Bāqir's time, presenting true beliefs and religious principles. During Imām Bāqir, such distortion manifested itself clearly and some corrupted individuals from among them came to be leaders of their movement.

Mughīra Ibn Sa'īd was one of them whose lifetime was mostly spent during Imām Bāqir's time and was burned to death in 119 A.H. by Khālid Ibn 'Abd Allāh Qasrī, Iraqi governor, calling him a magician, Ṭabarī quoted that he along with seven others ran wild against the administration outside Kūfa. Being on mosque pulpit, Khālid was told about this and requested water! It is good to mention that Mughīra was one of Khālid Ibn 'Abd Allāh's Mawālī.[1] Later on, Khālid burned both his companions and him to death for they had not relinquished their beliefs. There are several quotations from Kashshī revealing Imām Bāqir's abhorence towards him.[2] Some actions of him were manipulating Imām Bāqir's traditions and teaching magic as well as juggling.[3]

Regarding the Exaggerators' conduct towards Imām Bāqir (a), Abū Hurayra 'Idjlī wrote these verses,

ابـــا جعفر أنت الولي أحبّـه وأرضـــى بمـــا ترضي به وأتابع
أتتنا رجال يحتـــــلون عليكم أحاديث قد ضافت بهن الاضالع
أحاديث افشاها المغيرة فيهـــم وشر الامور المحدثات البدائع [4]

"O, Abū Dja'far, you are master and beloved one to me. I am satisfied with whatsoever you are satisfied with and I do follow you. There are some individuals attributing some traditions to you. This is something which downhearts us. Mughīra had forged some traditions which is the worst heresy."

Bayān Ibn Sam'ān[5] was another one supporting Mughīra. He was also burned to death along with Mughīra by Khālid Ibn 'Abd Allāh.[6]

In Shi'ite Muslims sources, Bayān Ibn Sam'ān was bitterly reproached since he was said to have quoted false traditions.[1] Ḥamza Ibn 'Amāra al-

---

1. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, pp.566,567; al-Milal wa l-niḥal, vol.I, p.157; he has mentioned his ideas as to analogy

2. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.V, p.321

3. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p.223 on.

4. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.II, p.151

5. In some books it is mentioned "Banān" while in some others such as Ṭabarī, it is "Bayān" which the latter one is apparently true.

6. al-Maqālāt wa l-firaq, p.33

Barbarī just the same as Abu l-Khaṭṭāb Ghālī, Bazī' and Mughīra Ibn Sa'īd were all cursed by Imāms.[2]

There are detailed descriptions of the Exaggerators and their beliefs in Sa'd Ibn 'Abd Allāh and Nuwbakhtī books. Despite the fact that both the Exaggerators and their leaders were corrupted, one should be heedful enough while dealing with what had been written concerning them in sectarian and religious books in particular those which had been compiled by Sunnis with great pessimism.

It deems appropriate to take Imām Ṣādiq's reactions towards the Exaggerators during his life throughout the Umayyads's time when both in this time and during the 'Abbāsids they were very active.

It should be noted that the Exaggerator's deviation was to such an extent that the religious principles were at risk. What they had in minds was not to leave a single principle of religion, either fundamental or practical one untainted. Anyhow, it appears that they had mystical inclinations according to which some people were deceived after being fascinated by their attractions. The Exaggerators were more active in Ḥidjāz than anywhere else since Iraq was a place where various cultures such as Iranian, Russian, Syriac and Jewish and so forth met and it had the capacity to put an impression on Muslims' attitudes. These interactions confused most religious beliefs.

The notion of Exaggeration threatened Shi'ism since it not only had falsified their principles from within and secluded them but also distorted public images towards them in such a way that it seemed they were indifferent to the practical laws of Islam.[3]

Taking a glance at sectarian books, it can be perceived in spite of the fact that, considering sectarian divisions, Exaggeration is said to be a distinct one, not only the leaders of various sects but Sunnites scholars as well do not differentiate between various divisions of Shi'ism and prevent from endorsing their traditions. One of the reasons of such pessimism is influence of the ideas of Exaggerators on Shi'ite Muslims. Despite all efforts being made firstly by Imāms and secondly their scholars, the effects are still more and less obvious. To bring an example, one can refer to some quotations

---

[1]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p. 302

[2]. Ibid. p. 305

[3]. Once he said, one of the Khāridjites had blamed the Shi'ite Muslims for thinking that they were needless of taking righteous actions and that they were spared from pain because of their evil deeds, See, al-Aghānī, vol.XX, p.107, quoted from al-'Aqidat wa l-sharī'a fī l-islām, p.203

from the Exaggerators regarding Qur'ān's distortion in some of the Shi'ites hadith books.[1]

Imām Ṣādiq (a) and subsequent Imāms opposed strongly that falsification. Previously, endeavors being made in an interval from 'Alī (a) to Imām Bāqir had brought about Ahl al-Bayt's popularity as well as expansion of Shi'ism. Accordingly, the Exaggerators were trying hard to penetrate deep into Shi'ite Muslims with the intention of damaging it both internally and externally. From among crucial undertakings of Imām Ṣādiq (a) to preserve noble Islamic culture bestowed to Shi'ite Muslims were purification of Shi'ism, struggle to negate the Exaggerators as well as remove them from approaching Shi'ite Muslims' instances of which are to be divulged here.

One of the central activities of Imām was preventing Shi'ite Muslims from having relationship with the Exaggerators since it could magnetize some of the Shi'ite Muslims to them with all their possible attractions. Besides, they claimed that they were tied to Imāms and upon denying them, they expressed what they had done was simply out of dissimulation.

Mufaḍḍal quoted Imām Ṣādiq (a) as referred to Abu l-Khaṭṭāb as well as other Exaggerators, as saying, يا مفضّل! لا تقاعدوهم ولا تؤاكلوهم ولاتشاربوهم ولا تصافحوهم[2] "O, Mufaḍḍal, do avoid the Exaggerators, neither eat or drink with them and do not shake hands with them."

In another quotation once again Imām (a) accentuated the statement, و أما ابوالخطاب محمد ابي زينب الأجدع ملعون وأصحابه ملعونون، فلا تجالس اهل مقالتهم فاني منهم برئ وآبائي عليهم السلام منهم براء[3] "Both Abu l-Khaṭṭāb and his followers are cursed. Do not have association with their supporters. My forefathers had abhored him, so do I."

Imām (a) was in particular heedful to the Shi'ites youth stating, احذروا على شبابكم الغلاة لا يفسدوهم، الغلاة شرّ خلق الله، يصغّرون عظمة الله ويدّعون الربوبيّة لعباد الله[4] "Remain watchful not to let the Exaggerators deviate your young men. They are the Allāh's archfoes. Reducing His Majesty, they profess to His servants that they are God."

Imām Ṣādiq (a) had warned individuals against having association with not only the Exaggerators, but all the innovators as well stating, واحذر مجالسة اهل البدع فانها تنبت في القلب كفراً وضلالاً مبيناً[5] "Do not keep company with innovators

---

[1]. See, Ukdhūbat Taḥrīf al-qur'ān Bayn al-shī'a wa l-Sunna, p.66

[2]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, hadith,525; Mustadrak al-wasā'il, vol.12, p.315

[3]. al-Ghayba, p.177; Mustadrak al-wasā'il, vol.12, p.315

[4]. al-Amālī, Shiykh Ṭūsī, vol.2, p.246

[5]. Mustadrak al-wasā'il, vol.12, p..315; Miṣbāḥ al-sharī'a, p.389

inasmuch as it sows the seeds of blasphemy in your heart as well as misleading you overtly."

To exclude them from membership of a Shi'ites society, Imām Ṣādiq (a) found fault with their beliefs and urged people not to accept them by referring to Allāh's Book for his evaluation.

Shahristānī quoted that Sudayr Ṣayrafī had gone to Imām and said, "May I be your sacrifice! Your followers have diverse opinions; some are of the beliefe that some one whispers in your ears; some say that Allāh reveals secret to you; some think that you are inspired; some others assume that you see in your dreams or give decree based on your forefathers' command. Which one is true?

In response, Imām said, لا تأخذ بشيء مما يقولون نحن حجة الله وأمناءه على خلقه، حلالنا من كتاب الله وحرامنا منه[1] "DO not accept whatsoever they tell you. We are Allāh's witness and faithful ones for His servants and we do consider something either lawful or unlawful while having reference to His Book."

Quotations of this kind indicate that due to the wrong beliefs of the Exaggerators some were doubtful whether Imāms introduced new religions or there would be new revelations. Underlining the fact that whatsoever they say comes from Allāh's Book, Imām Ṣādiq (a) demanded people not to endorse those wrong beliefs.

In another quotation, Shahristānī stated that Fayḍ Ibn Mukhtār went to Imām Ṣādiq (a) and said, "May I be your sacrifice! What is this divergence among our Shi'ite Muslims? At times, I attend their meeting and I feel apprehensive about what they say. Then I refer to Mufaḍḍal and find out what makes me calm there."

In response Imām (a) said, اجل! انّ الناس اغروا بالكذب علينا حتى كأنّ الله فرضه عليهم لايريد منهم غيره، واني لأحدّث أحدهم الحديث، فلا يخرج مني حتى تتأوله على غير تأويله[2] "See individuals are fond of laying the blame on us as if Allāh made them do so and not anything else. When I say something to someone, he alters it soon before leaving me."

Sahmī quoted 'Īsā al-Ḥudjrānī as saying, "I went to Dja'far Ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣādiq and said,"Shall I retell what I heard from this tribe?"

Imām replied, "Say it."

I said, فانّ طائفة منهم عبدوك واتّخذوك الهاً من دون الله وطائفة أُخري والوا لك النبوة و... "Some of these people do worship you and consider you a God quite different from Allāh and another group do regard you as a prophet."

---

[1]. Turāthunā Magazine. No.12, pp.17-18, article, "Ahl Bayt fī ra'y ṣāḥib al-Milal wa l-niḥal" quoted from Maṣābīḥ al-asrār.

[2]. Maṣābīḥ al-asrār, Ibid. p.26, Turāthunā Magazine, No.12, p.18

Imām wepet bitter tears, then said, ان أمكنني الله من هولاء فلم اسفك دمائهم سفك الله دم ولدي علي يدي[1] "If I dominate them at Allāh's behest, I will surely shed their blood; otherwise, Allāh will do the same to my son."

Occasionally, the narrators of quotations manipulate what Imāms had said according to their tests with the intention of nullifying basic principles of Shi'ite Muslims. Thereafter, some of them will be mentioned.

Mahdavitism was the central belief of the Exaggerators which was rejected by Imām Ṣādiq (a).[2] They also believe in prophecy of some Imāms.

Imām Ṣādiq (a) told them, من قال انا انبياء فعليه لعنة الله ومن شك في ذلك فعليه لعنة الله[3] "God may curse whosoever regards us as His Prophet and whosoever remains skeptical of it."

From among the Exaggerators, some had equated God with Imām saying, هو الذي في السماء اله وفي الارض اله قالوا هو الامام He is the one who exists in the heavens and earth, they said, "He is Imām."

That was why Imām Ṣādiq (a) told that they were even worse than Magians, Jews, Christians and the unbelievers.[4]

Imām was at odds with the Exaggerators in particular with those beliefs based on which they attributed Godliness to Imāms.

The he went on to say, لعن الله من قال فينا ما لا نقوله في انفسنا ولعن الله من أزالنا عن العبودية لله والذي خلقنا واليه ما بنا ومعادنا وبيده نواصينا[5] "May Allāh curse those who quote us as saying what not told by us. May Allāh curse those refraining us from worshiping Him, He who has created us and we all will to Him while He determines our fate."

As maintained by Islamic jurisprudence, it deems right to excommunicate individuals denying basic principles of Islam. This is done to prevent violations provided that it do develop through its normal course. Imām Ṣādiq (a) endeavored to excommunicate the Exaggerators from Islamic society to frostrate them from distorting the Shi'ites fundamental principles.

One of the undertakings of the Exaggerators was symbolizing religious notions in such a way that they lose their basic significations. Imām Ṣādiq (a) in a letter addressing Abu l-Khaṭṭāb, one of the Exaggerator's leaders, stated, بلغني انك تزعم انّ الزنا رجل وأنّ الخمر رجل وأنّ الصلاة رجل وأنّ الصيام رجل وأن الفواحش

---

[1]. Tārikh Djurdjān, pp.322, 323

[2]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p.300

[3]. Ibid. p.301

[4]. Ibid. p. 300

[5]. Ibid. p.302

رجل وليس هو كما تقول، انا اصل الحق، وفروع الحق طاعة الله، وعدونا أصل الشر وفروعهم الفواحش[1] "You are said to be of the opinion that adultery, intoxication, prayer, fasting and mischief are all men with these names. What you said is not true. I am the supreme truth and in comparison worshiping Allāh is subordinate one. Our enemies are the major evil while their mischief is a minor thing in comparison."

In another quotation, Imām stated, على أبي الخطاب لعنة الله والملائكة والناس اجمعين فاشهد أنّه كافر فاسق مشرك[2] "May Allāh, His angels as well as His servants put a curse on Abu l-Khattāb. I do confess that he is infidel, lewd and polytheist."

Somewhere else, by referring to the Exaggerators, Imām (a) stated, توبوا الى الله فانكم فساق كفار مشركون[3] "Do repent your sins. You are undoubtedly lewd, infidel and polytheist."

Imām Ṣādiq excommunicated them so openly that, on one hand, they themselves perceived there was no longer any dissimulation and, on the other hand, Shi'ite Muslims stopped having communication with the Exaggerators completely.

The Exaggerators could publicize their beliefs primarily due to the fact that they called on their followers not to observe either jurisprudic legals or inhibitions.

They quoted Imām Ṣādiq (a) as saying, "Whomsoever knows Imām, he shall be permitted to do whatsoever he wants to."

To remove all doubts Imām said, انّما قلتُ: ان عرفت، فاعمل ماشئت من قليل الخير وكثيره، فإنه يقبل منك[4] "I said if you knew your Imām, you would surely do good either less or more. Such cognition is the key to the acceptance of your practices."

Imām alluded to the fact that ordinances are subordinate to sainthood (Wilāyat) or without which observing such rules is worthless. The Exaggerators did not take the primary meaning of that statement into account based on their non-observance of the jurisprudic rules. They were quite distinguishable from those who were adherent to them.[5]

One influential factor in the emergence of the Exaggerators was public stupidity.[6] At the same time, ambition as well as yearning to attract individuals, especially with regard to those who claimed succession of

---

1. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl. p. 219
2. Ibid. p. 297
3. Ibid. p. 297
4. al-Kāfī, vol.4, p.464
5. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p. 530
6. Ibid. p.295

Imāms and upgraded them to Godliness with the intention of introducing themselves as prophets were other leading factors.

Imām Ṣādiq (a) asserted, إنّ الناس اولعوا الكذب علينا... وانّي أُحدّث أحدهم بحديث فلا يخرج من عندي حتى يتأوّله على غيرَ تأويله وذلك أنّهم لا يطلبون بحديثنا وبحبنا ما عند الله وإنما يطلبون الدنيا[1] "Individuals are eager to falsify our accounts. Even before we end our speech, they reiterate it to others regardless of its exact meaning. Neither in learning traditions nor seeking our friendship do they desire what Allāh wants rather they are after mammonism."

To discriminate the forged traditions of the Exaggerators from the authentic ones motioned by Ahl al-Bayt, Imām Ṣādiq (a) referred to Qur'ān as a criterion.

Regarding this he stated, لا تقبلوا علينا حديثاً الا ما وافق القرآن والسنة او تجدون معه شاهداً من احاديثنا المتقدمه فان المغيرة بن سعيد لعنه الله دسّ في كتب ابي احاديث لم يحدث بها ابي، فاتقوا الله ولا تقبلوا علينا ما خالف قول ربنا تعالي وسنة نبيّنا صلى الله علي واله، فإنا إذا حدثنا قلنا قال الله عز وجل وقال رسول الله[2] "Do not accept whatsoever they quote from us on condition that they are in accordance with either Qur'ān or Sunna or our previous traditions. May Allāh curse Mughīra Ibn Sa'īd, the one who quoted traditions from my father not told by him. Be pious and do not endorse whatsoever is at odds with Qur'ān and Sunna since whatsoever we quote is based on these two sources."

There are some other quotations indicating the same action of the Exaggerators.

For instance, Imām Ṣādiq (a) said, "Mughīra took home the books being written by Imām Bāqir's companions then, ثم ويدسُّ فيها الكفر والزندقة ويسندها الى ابي يدفعها الى اصحابه "He quoted hadiths from the dualists and attributed them to my father after that, he returned those to their owners."

Imām also stated, فكلما كان في كتب اصحاب ابي من الغلّو، فذاك ما دسّه مغيرة بن سعيد في كتبهم[3] "Whatsoever can be found in the books of my father's companions regarding the Exaggerators are nothing but what Mughīra registered there."

Such action of Imām Ṣādiq (a), on one hand, could differentiate the Shi'ite Muslims from the Exaggerators but, on the other hand, it had a negative effect on Shi'ite Muslims' expansion. Just because of the Exaggerators, Abū Ḥanīfa told his followers not to reiterate Ghadīr hadith.[4] Not withstanding the fact that it was quite unacceptable, it could divulge the impact of the Exaggerators' action on quoting the most accurate accounts of 'Alī's virtues.

---

[1]. Ibid. p.136

[2]. Ibid. p.224

[3]. Ibid. p.225

[4]. Shiykh Mufīd, al-Amālī, p.27

This was discussed in detail since it was supposed to reveal not only the Exaggerators' deviation in the History of Shi'ism but also the reaction of Imāms in protecting Shi'ism from threat of the Exaggerators inasmuch as they roused public hatred towards Ahl al-Bayt.[1] And they had to defend themselves.

SHI'ISM WHEN GIVING SUPERIORITY TO 'ALĪ (A)

Speaking about the internal affairs of Shi'ism, there still is another form of Shi'ism which merely appreciates the 'Alawites and considers them as the true ones for caliphate while according to its principle neither Imamate is a divine leadership nor Imām is someone whose obedience is mandatory. In the realm of policy and leadership, taking the distinct features of them in comparison with other influential tribes into account, one can observe that 'Alī (a) was superior that 'Uthmān as well as other caliphs.[2] In view of such definition of Shi'ism, not only majority of the Sunnis traditionalists but Iraqi ones as well are Shi'ites. Reviewing Mīzān al-I'tidāl from Dhahabī, one can see that a great number of religious scholars later come to be known as Sunnites were believed to be Shi'ites at that time. From among them, there were some people as Muḥammad Ibn Djarīr Ṭabarī[3] and Ḥukaym Niyshābūrī, the greatest Sunnites scholars in the 3rd and 4th centuries, who severely criticized Mu'āwiya. These people were not few in Iraq in 1A.H. most of whom were irritated by Ḥadjdjādj and other Umayyads's rulers just due to their devotion to Imām 'Alī (a) as well as to the Prophet's progeny.

What should not be left out of consideration regarding this group is that they were by no means Shi'ites based on its principles. The expansion of Shi'ism in Kūfa due to the presence of both Imām 'Alī (a) and his son there for over five years was the basic cause of the formation of that group there. Embracing Shi'ism, some individuals at that time spread it in that region. On the other hand, there were also some traditionalists of Kūfa affected by this morale. They refrained from quoting Imām 'Alī's virtues just the same as others since they were influenced by 'Uthmān. He as well as his supporters criticized Kūfiyān hadith-narrators since they did not observe the limitations being imposed by them on not only quoting Ahl al-Bayt's virtues but the evils of companions for the very reason, such individuals as A'mash the so-

---

[1]. al-'Aqīdat wa l-sharī'a fi l-islām, p.207

[2]. This was scrutinized under the title of "Political Shī'ism" in Tārīkh tashayyu'.

[3]. Regarding his religion, we have an article in the book entitled "Djughrāfiyāy Insānī shī'a".

called Shi'ites Muslim, was accused of forging hadiths narrated by the residents of Kūfa.[1]

Once Iraqis were said to be Shi'ites but by taking all limitations into account, one can understand what kind of Shi'ism it is, despite the fact that there were many Shi'ite Muslims who considered Ahl al-Bayt merely as their Imāms and leaders.

A real Shi'ites follower is someone who only believes in the Imamate of 'Alī's descendants and regards them as the successor of the successors[2] whose obedience is obligatory regardless of his political power. Belief in this principle was a criterian to distinguish ideological Shi'ism from others and those who were skeptical in this regard were not from Shi'ite Muslims. Abān Ibn Taghlib in this regard mentioned, الشيعة، الذين اذا اختلف الناس عن رسول الله صلي الله وعليه واله، اخذوا بقول علي عليه السلام، واذا اختلف الناس عن علي اخذوا بقول جعفر بن محمد عليه السلام "A Shi'ite Muslim is someone who endorses whatsoever Imām 'Alī (a) said, once people were at variance concerning what Allāh's Messenger has said and when soever the same happened concerning 'Alī's utterances, he should accept whatever Dja'far Ibn Muḥammad mentioned."[3]

This meaning of Imamate was based on "Ghadīr hadith" and those who did not believe in this were called the Disavowers. Imāms probably turned their back on them merely to keep face.[4] Ahl al-Bayt's quotations, on the other hand, presented a clear definition of sainthood which was the cornerstone of Shi'ites beliefs. There are numerous quotations which equate sainthood with prayer, fasting, Ḥadjdj and tax alms and at times, it is even more emphasized.[5] In practice, the Imāms who were Shi'ites leadership asked people for paying their financial dues to them. They not only considered the rulers as oppressors and manifestation of tyranny but also said they are legitimate and divine Imāms. Accordingly, they did carry out financial as well as political responsibilities upon them.

---

[1]. Shadjarāt al-dhahb, vol. 1, p. 221

[2]. This title "The successor of the successors (Waṣī al-awṣiyā') was referred to Imāms by ideological Shi'ism when Djābir Ibn Yazīd Dju'fī quoted from Imām Bāqir (a) he said, حدثني وصي الاوصياء O, the successor of the successors tell traditions for us

This was what dispersed the Sunnites narrators of hadith from him. As Sufyān al-Thawrī said he had disparaged them by his work. See, al-Ma'rifat wa l-tārikh, vol.2, p.716; Mīzān al-i'tidāl, vol.1, p.383; Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb, vol.2, p.49

[3]. Ridjāl al-nadjāshī, p.12, under the biography of Abān Ibn Taghlib.

[4]. Regarding Imām's behavior towards Zurāra Ibn A'yān, one of the Sunnites, see, al-Ma'rifat wa l-tārikh, vol.2, p.672; Mīzān al-i'tidāl, vol.2, p.69.

[5]. See, Wasā'il al-shī'a, vol.1, pp.7,10,11,12,17,18

Once Imām Bāqir (a) was asked about his father's inheritance, he said, ما ما كان لأبي بسبب الإمامة فهو لي وما كان غير ذلك فهو ميراث على كتاب الله وسنّة نبيه[1] "I am heir to my father's position and other things, except this, which are my father's personal features are to be divided in accordance with Qur'ān as well as Prophet's Sunna."

There are some quotations regarding booties, in which the Imāms made it quite clear that they have been the right owners of them.[2] Unfortunately, some of the ignorant writers of Sunnis as well as the orientalists, regardless of so many quotations in various aspects of our Islamic jurisprudence, presented our Imāms in such a way as if they did claim they were Imāms and were attributed by others; however, there are numerous quotations from Shi'ite Muslims, as said before, which remove all historical doubts.

There were a great number of people in Iraq who were of the opinion that the Ahl al-Bayt were selected by Allāh's Prophet and obeying from them was mandatory. However, they might be misled regarding some facts. Hishām Ibn 'Abd al-Malik who was apprehensive of the 'Alawites' rebellion wrote a letter to Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar expressing the opinion of Kūfiyāns, اما بعد, فقد عرفت حال اهل الكوفة في حبّهم اهل البيت ووضعهم ايّاهم في غير مواضعهم لافتراضهم علي انفسهم طاعتهم (و وظّفوا عليهم شرائع دينهم) وخلتهم ايّاهم عظيم ما هو كائن مما استأثر الله بعلمه دونهم[3] "You know quite well how Kūfiyāns adore Ahl al-Bayt. They exaggerate about them. They believe that they should obey them in their religious activities because they believe they have some kind of wisdom granted to no one but them."

The content of this letter indicates that there has been a kind of ideological Shi'ism whose milestone was Imām, someone who defined the Islamic law for them and his obedience was incumbent. As referred before, this issue was subject to debate. Since Iraqi Shi'ite Muslims, on one hand, were for from Medina, the main residence of Imāms as well as other 'Alawites, and, on the other hand, they were pressurized by the Umayyads and later on, by the 'Abbāsids rulers they, could not understand who the veritable Imām was; nevertheless, from the very beginning, it was believed that only 'Alī's descendants were given the right to rule. To verify this, refer to what had been mentioned regarding political views of the Penitents. A matter of prime importance was Shi'ism in Qum originated from Kūfa. The strong belief of the people of this city in Shi'ism indicated that the Ash'arites in this city had learnt the basic principles of Shi'ism in Kūfa.

As it was previously mentioned, since Shi'ites Imāms were far away from Medina, deviations in Shi'ism came about, one of which was the

---

[1]. Wasā'il al-shī'a, vol.6, p.374

[2]. See, al-Ḥukūmat al-islāmīyya fī Aḥādīth al-shī'at al-imāmiyya, pp.84-88

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.238; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.489

Imamate of Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya who was supposed to be veritable Imām subsequent to ʻAlī (a), Imām Ḥasan and Imām Ḥusayn (a). Despite the fact that this belief was not widespread, it did undoubtedly exist.

"Kuthayyir ʻAzza" died in 105 A.H. was among poets who had Shiʻites beliefs.[1] He was actually from the Kissānīds who believed that Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya was an Imām.

He wrote these verses,

ألا إن الائـــمـــة من قريش ولاة الحـــق اربـعة ســواء
علـي والثلاثـــة مـن بنـيه هم الاســـباط ليس بهم خفاء
فسبط سبط ايمـــان وبـــرّ وســـبط غـيـبته كـربـلاء
وسبط لاتـــراه العـــين حتي يقـود الخيـل يقـدمها اللـواء
تغيّب لايري عنـــهم زمانا برضوي عنده عســـل وماء [2]

"Take it into account that our Imāms are four people from the Quraysh tribe. ʻAlī and three children of him, one of them, Ḥasan Ibn ʻAlī is the epitome of piety and kindness. The other one is the one being embraced by Karbalā and the third is the one who can not be seen by eyes until an army appears with a flag in its forefront. For a while he would be on Raḍawī mountain, out of sight with honey and water at hand."

Raḍawī is one of the sacred mountains around Medina.

Other poems from the very same author hint at his belief in Mahdavitism of Ibn Ḥanafiyya,

فهديت يا مهدينا ابن المتهدي انت الذي نرقّي به ونرتجي
انت ابن خيرالناس من بعد النبي انت إمام الحق لنسا نمتري
يابن علي سر ومن مثل علي[3]

"O our leader! May He raise thy blessings, thou art the one whose light of guidance we seek to our sublimity and we stay fully hopeful of him. Thou art descendant of the best man after the Prophet (s), no doubt our truthful Imām. O son of ʻAlī! Thou art like ʻAlī among us."

Regardless of his misinterpretation of the true Shiʻism, Kuthayyir ʻAzza basically believed in the cornerstone of Shiʻism, that is divine sainthood. Accordingly, he did not accept caliphate subsequent to prophet.

In a poem, he wrote,

برئت إلي الإله من ابن اروى ومن دين الخوارج اجمعينا
و من عمر برئت ومن عتيق غداة دعي امير المؤمنينا [1]

---

[1]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.V, p.292; al-Aghānī, vol.IX, p.3

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.202; al-Aghānī, vol.IX, p.14; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.78; Sayyid Ḥimyarī has composed similar piece of poem; al-Aghānī, vol.VII, p.245

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.289

"I invoke by God to resent 'Uthmān and the Khāridjites as well as 'Umar and Abū Bakr, once called Amīr al-Mu'minīn."

One of the principles of ideological Shi'ism in rejecting the legitimacy of the first caliphs since based on it Imamate is at Allāh's behest. Khandaq al-Asadī was a friend of Kuthayyir who once was in Ḥadjdj along with him. Suddenly he shouted, "You had relinquished both the truth and your Prophet's Household consisting of four people and they are right".

Revolting against him, people beat him to death.[2] Iṣfahānī has a quotation in Aghānī revealing that Imām Bāqir (a) had taken part in Kuthayyir's funeral ceremony and asked others to let him go under his coffin.[3] It was probable that Kuthayyir just the same as Sayyid Ḥimyarī in the course of time either had given up he Kīssanids or due to his friendship with Ahl al-Bayt supported them.

Sayyid Ḥimyarī, one of the Shi'ites poets, was a member of the Kīssanids too. Addressing Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya who was believed to be alive on Raḍawī mount, he wrote these verses,

ألا قل للوصي فدتك نفسي اطلت بذلك الجبل المقاما[4]

"Tell the successor, May my life be sacrificed to you, you overstayed in that mountain."

There are many poems about his religion. At the same time, there are some quotations indicating his change of religion, which are all declared untrue by Iṣfahānī based on his reference to some narrators. Based on some poems attributed to him, it was said that he believed in Imamate of Dja'far Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Ṣādiq (a). It is not obvious why much effort was made to declare these verses untrue. Anyhow, it can have several reasons. For example, it had been proposed to say that he obeyed the Exaggerators not Imām Ṣādiq. In a poem regarding his conversion, he was quoted as saying, تجعفرت باسم الله والله اكبر[5] "In the name of Lord, the Exalted, I am turned to Dja'farī religion."

---

[1]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.II, p.246; al-Shi'r wa l-shu'arā'', p.316; Tārīkh al-adab al-'arabī, al-'aṣr al-islāmī, p.323; This poem is quoted from Sayyid Ḥimyarī in Aghānī, vol.VII, p.276,277

[2]. al-Aghānī, vol. 12, p.174

[3]. Ibid. vol.9, p. 37

[4]. Ibid. vol.9, p.14; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.202; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.79

[5]. al-Aghānī, vol.7, p.213; see, Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.79

This verse is called in question, Ithough not so strongly, since Sayyid because of his enough eloquence in speech could not have said, تجعفرت باسم الله In another poem, he went on to say,

أيا راكباً نحو المدينة جسرة عذا فرة قموي بها كلّ سبسب

إذا ما هداك الله لاقيت جعفراً فقل, يا امين الله وابن المهذّب [1]

"O thou who art on sturdy camelback trotting through deserts

O noble! Once thou meet Djaʻfar, tell him he is trustee of God and the pure one."

Kashshī also has a quotation[2] indicating his conversion to Twelve-Imām Shiʻism. He had done so probably due to his argument with Muʻmin al-Ṭāq, one of the companions of Imām Ṣādiq (a) and a man of debate, in which he was defeated.[3] Since he died in Manṣūr's time, it was impossible for him to be still a Kīssanids. On the other hand, the number of followers of this sect is not obvious or it is better to say that apart from some quotations mentioned previously, there is no other proof affirming the existence of other followers of this sect. Additionally, a number of followers were decreased since they came to obey either ʻAbd Allāh Ibn Muʻāwiya or the ʻAbbāsids.

There also are some verses from Sayyid Ḥimyarī indicating his hatred towards the early caliphs.[4] When Mahdī ʻAbbāsi was heir apparent, he asked him to cut off gifts been given to Banū Taym and Banū ʻAdī inasmuch as they had deprived Ahl al-Bayt of their rights after Prophet's departure.[5] Aghānī quoted that Imām Ṣādiq invoked God's blessing for him.[6]

The role of poets such as Kuthayyir ʻAzza Sayyid Ḥimyarī, Kumayt Ibn Zayd Asadī was of a prime significance in depicting the characteristics of Ahl al-Bayt particularly ʻAlī (a). They used the most delicate expressions in this regard. It was said that he never wrote a poem without mentioning this very verse,

أجد بآل فاطمة البكور فدمع العين منهمر غزير[7]

Family of Fāṭima hath a hard time,that is why tears roll down stormily

or in another poem he said,

---

[1]. al-Aghānī, vol.7, p.213; see, Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.79

[2]. Ikhtiyār Maʻrifat al-ridjāl, p.288

[3]. Ibid. p.245

[4]. al-Aghānī, vol.7, pp.273-274

[5]. Ibid. vol.VII, pp.243-244

[6]. Ibid. vol.7, pp. 242,277

[7]. Ibid. p.245

أقسم بالله وآلائه والمرء عما قال مسئول
أن عليّ بن ابي طالب على التُقى والبَر مجبول

"I do swear by Allāh and hisblessings, individuals shall be asked about what they say, Surely 'Alī is created a pure one."

He vocalized, من أتاني بفضيلة لعلي بن ابي طالب ما قلت فيها شعراً فله ألف دينار[1] "Whosoever tells me even one of the 'Alī's virtues about which I had not written a poem, I will give him one thousand Dīnārs."

Demonstrating the role of the Shi'ites poet is a matter of great significance but can not be discussed here.[2]

True belief in Shi'ism, something which prevailed among all the Shi'ite Muslims had emanated from instructions being disseminated by Imāms. During the above-mentioned time, Imām Bāqir and Ṣādiq (a) played the same role. There were a great number of hadith narrators among the followers of Imām Bāqir (a) with their names mentioned in the Shi'ites scholastic books such as Ridjāl by Ṭūsī.[3] Verifying merely those traditions being narrated by the Imāms regarding either the Islamic Jurisprudence or Sharī'a was one of the basic requirements in accepting the divine leadership of Imāms. In other words, Imāms made every effort to introduce Ahl al-Bayt as the politico-religious pillar. Here, the issue of full-scale obedience is a central principle which requires all to refer to Ahl al-Bayt on different things, something reiterated in the speeches of the Infallible Imāms from 'Alī's time onwards. Previously, we touched upon 'Alī's remarks concerning Ahl al-Bayt and their stances. During the late 1st and 2nd centuries when Imām Bāqir and Imām Ṣādiq (a), led the Shi'ite Muslims, various sects appeared each of which claimed the leadership of Muslims. Accepting the political leadership of caliphs, the majority of them struggled to have the religious leadership in their own hands. On the other hand, the Shi'ites Imāms, as it was mentioned in "Thaqalayn hadith", underlined that the sole reliable sources are Qur'ān and Ahl al-Bayt.

Imām Bāqir (a) in his speeches most of the time called on people to take advantage of the knowledge of Ahl al-Bayt and just accept what they say as true traditions. In his speed, Imām Said to Salama Ibn Kuhayl and Ḥakam Ibn 'Uyayna, شرّقا او غرّبا فلا تجدان علماً صحيحاً الا شيئاً خرج من عندنا[4] "Traverse both

---

[1]. Ibid. p.257

[2]. Our knowledgable friend, Mr.Ṣādiq Ā'īniwand talks in detail about biography of the Shi'ites poets and the men of letters and the role in preserving values revolutionary Shī'ism, in his book titled Adabiyāt Inqilāb dar shī'a (Literature of Revolution in Shī'ism)

[3]. Ridjāl al-ṭusī, p.102-142

[4]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, pp.209-210; al-Kāfī, vol.1, p.399; Baṣā'ir al-daradjāt, p.9

the East and the West of the world, then you will know no science is the accurate one save that of us."

In another quotation referring to Ḥasan Baṣrī, one of the renowned scholars of that time, he said, فليذهب الحسن – يعني البصري – يميناً وشمالاً فوالله ما يوجد العلم الا هيهنا[1] "Ḥasan Baṣrī can go wherever he wants, but I swear by Allāh he can acquire knowledge nowhere but from us."

In another quotation, Imām said, فليذهب الناس حيث شاء وا، فوالله ليس الأمر الا من هيهنا– وأشار إلى بيته[2] "Individuals can go wherever they want, but I swear by Allāh they can find it nowhere but here, then he referred to his house."

Such utterances invite people to refer to Ahl al-Bayt to receive Islamic instructions. The acceptance was equal to embracing Shi'ism.

Somewhere else, Imām Bāqir (a) said, آل محمد ابواب الله والدعاة إلى الجنة والقادة اليها[3] "Muḥammad's descendants are the gates of divine knowledge through which people can attract Allāh's satisfaction. They call people to the Heaven and drive them towards it."

Imām also said, كلّ شي لم يخرج من هذا البيت فهو وبال[4] "Whatsoever comes out of any house other than this would be harmful."

Our insistence in mentioning these statements be due to their notable effect on the formatain of Shi'ism.

Imām Bāqir (a) also said, ايها الناس! أين تذهبون واين يراد بكم؟ بنا هدي الله اوّلكم وبنا ختم آخركم[5] "O people! Where are you going? And where have you been gone? From the very beginning, you have been guided by Ahl al-Bayt and at last, all of you will return to them."

When Hishām came to Medina, Imām said, الحمد لله الذي بعث محمد بالحق نبياً وأكرمنا به، فنحن صفوة الله على خلقه وخيرته على عباده وخلفاءه، فالسعيد من اتبعنا والشّقي من عادانا وخالفنا[6] "Praise be to Allāh, He who selected Muḥammad as our prophet. We were respected just because of him. Accordingly, we are selected caliphs from among his creatures. Only those who follow us are fortunate not those who consider us as their enemy and disobey us."

Because of such utterances, Imām Bāqir(a) was summoned to Damascus by Hishām. In Imām Ṣādiq's statements, it has been stressed that all other ways lead to their deviation. Imām (a) said, ايتها العصابة! عليكم بآثار رسول الله (ص)

---

[1]. al-Kāfī, vol.I, p.51; Wasā'il al-shi'a, vol.18, p.42

[2]. al-Kāfī, vol.1, p.399; Baṣā'ir al-daradjāt, p.12

[3]. Tafsīr al-ayyāshī, vol.1, p.86; Wasā'il al-shī'a, vol.18, p.9

[4]. al-mīzān, vol.3, p.176 from Kāfī

[5]. al-Kāfī, vol.1, p.478

[6]. Dalā'il al-imāma, p.104; Biḥār al-anwār, vol.46, p.306

وسنّته وآثار الائمة الهداة من اهل بيت رسول الله[1] "O Shi'ite Muslims! It is upon you to take Prophet's Sunna as well as the traditions of Imām from Ahl al-Bayt."

Somewhere else, he told Yūnus Ibn Ḍubyān, يا يونس! إن أردت العلم الصحيح فعندنا اهل البيت فانا ورثنا واوتينا شرع الحكمة وفصل الخطاب[2] "O Yūnus! We have the true knowledge inasmuch as we have inherited the paths of wisdom and ways of distinguishing the credal error from the gospel truth from Allāh's Prophet."

Imām Ṣādiq (a) said, ان عندنا مالانحتاج معه إلي الناس، وإنّ الناس ليحتاجون إلينا وإنّ عندنا كتابا باملاء رسول الله وخطّ علي، صحيفة فيها كل حلال وحرام[3] "We have something with which we are not in need of anyone while all are in need of us. We have a book which was dictated to 'Alī (a) by Allāh's Prophet. This book contains all ordinances of the lawful or unlawful."

This atterance was actually the repetition of what Imām 'Alī (a) had said to the residents of Kūfa several times, أهل الكوفة! سلونا عما قال الله ورسوله، فانا أهل البيت أعلم بما قال الله ورسوله[4] "O the residents of Kūfa! Ask us of what Allāh and his prophet has said. Ask us since Ahl al-Bayt are the most informed source of what they have said."

The evidence indicates that there has been a unanimous cultural movement on the part of Ahl al-Bayt and the Shi'ites Imāms to introduce Ahl al-Bayt as the center of religion of the Muslims.

One point should be taken into account is that the Shi'ite Muslims confronted some problems ideologically, as said before in discussing about the Exaggerators, due to dissimulation during the life of Imām Bāqir and Ṣādiq (a) regarding both the corrupt administrations and public uproar. In addition, Imāms themselves also faced some political problems not dealt with here. Regarding Ahl al-Bayt, as the authority was a justification for some linked to them as well as the Hāshimites to be claimant and raise some difficulties for them. The 'Alawites internal diisions had paved the ground for such deviations, and on one hand, led to the formation of fragmentation in Shi'ism and deprived Imāms of their rights of divine Imamate, on the other hand. Some of these divitions are to be discussed here.

ZAYD IBN 'ALĪ'S UPRISING AND THE ZAYDĪDS IN SHI'ISM

Zaydism is one of the sects of Shi'ism and an internal inclination. The practical and principle laws are similar to those of Sunnis. It is also somehow based on the Mu'tazilites and Ḥanafites principles. But regarding

---

[1]. Wasā'il al-shī'a, vol.18, pp.23,61; Rawḍat al-kāfī, p.5

[2]. Wasā'il al-shī'a, vol.18, p.48

[3]. al-Kāfī, vol.1, p. 241

[4]. al-Ma'rifat wa l-tārīkh, vol.2, p.759

political factors, it is mostly based on Shi'ism and all nations believe that this sect is actually a branch of Shi'ism.

It is generally believed that this has emanated from Zayd Ibn 'Alī's approach and its basic principles have been effected by his rebellion and all other movements are subordinate to it. Now this is discussed historically.

Zayd, the son of 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn (a), was born from an Umm Walad (a slave who had been freed) mother. It is supposed that Mukhtār had bestowed him to Imām Sadjdjād.[1] He is one of the 'Alawites who organized the first uprising of them subsequent to Karbalā's event. His action acctually was the beginning of other rebellions of this kind initiated by the Zaydids thereafter throughout the Islamic land. They, most of the time, withstood the Umayyads and 'Abbāsids' army while they were few.

According to Dīnwarī, the date of his rebellion goes back to 118 A.H. which is unreal.[2] On the other hand, Muḥammad Ibn Isḥāq said it was in the year 120 A.H..[3] While, based on other sources, it was most likely to be in 121 or 122 A.H. and it was surely in Ṣafar. While Ibn Kathīr mentioned that it was in 122 A.H.[4] other people such as Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd[5], Zubayr Ibn Bakkār[6], Mas'ūdī [7], as well as some others were of the opinion that it was in 121 A.H.[8]

A researcher referring to some evidence tried to say it occurred in 122 A.H..[9] Based on the evidence, in all probability, it happened in Ṣafar, 122 A.H.. It is said that since Ṣafar was the second month of the year and some of the preparatory steps of the rebellion have been taken in the previous year so it happened in 122 A.H.. Based on another evidence, Khālid was deposed in Djamādī al-Awwal, 120 and by referring to the events taking place thereafter during the specific period mentioned by the historians in which Zayd was in Kūfa, it is improbable to say that it took place at the beginning of the year 121 A.H..

---

1. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.86
2. Akhbār al-ṭiwāl p.328
3. 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.258
4. al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.9, p.328
5. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.7, p.165
6. 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.258
7. al-Tanbīh wa l-ishrāf, p.279
8. 'Umdat al-ṭālib (quoted by Wāqidī) p.121; Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.2, p. 326; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p. 482; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.206, (he has mentioned narration 122)
9. See, Sīrih wa qiyām Zayd Ibn 'Alī, p.24

The first happening of this rebellion is about the time when Khālid Ibn 'Abd Allāh Qasrī or, as mentioned in some quotations, Ṭāriq, Khālid's male slave[1] or his son Yazīd confessed under torture when Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar came to Iraq, individuals such as Zayd Ibn 'Alī, Dāwūd Ibn 'Alī and some others all owed them. Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar informed Hishām about it. Then, he called upon Yazīd and others to go to Damascus. They all said that such confession was not true. Accordingly, Hishām Ibn 'Abd al-Malik sent them to Kūfa to solve that problem before Khālid and Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar. Zayd and others who were afraid of Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar wrote a guarantee of clemency and even took someone to Kūfa along with themselves to judge Hishām's treatment towards them. Later on, it came to be known that Khālid or his son or Ṭāriq had done it since he was under torture and wanted to be released for a while.[2] This happening might have occured either after 120 A.H. or when Khālid was deposed. Again, at that time, Zayd was either in Medina, then was sent to Damascus at Hishām's behest once he was informed about what Khālid had done.[3] Or he himself was in Damascus or in its outskirts, based on some evidence, to solve his problems with the Ḥasanites concerning 'Alī's charity in there.

What some other quotations reveal is that Zayd had already travelled to Damascus. Based on them, Zayd who was at odd with 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥasan Ibn Ḥasan(a) over 'Alī's charity headed for Damascus so that Hishām personally might find the solution to this problem since it could not be settled in Medina but he refrained from visiting him and whenever Zayd wrote a letter to caliph, he wanted him to return to his home. Eventually, at Zayd's insistence, Hishām accepted to call upon him but he said that he could not admit what he has said and, after a shout while, made him to leave Damascus. Setting out for Medina at first, Zayd then shifted his way to Iraq.[4]

Apparently what this narration is to convey is different from why Zayd disapproved the Umayyads. It seems that Zayd went there before the time Khālid said. He was also troublesome to Zayd. Regarding Zayd's meeting with Hishām, the historians hinted at what made Zayd be angry with the Umayyads. Later on, Zayd himself told Djābir Dju'fī that he could not keep silent before Hishām while he was a tyrant and he was against Qur'ān.

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.231

[2]. See, Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, pp.482,483,487; Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, pp.90-91; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.231; al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.110; Tarikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.2, p.325

[3]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.472

[4]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.3, p.286-287; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.486; Riyāḍ al-'ulamā', vol.2, pp. 319-323

Zayd said, "I saw myself how a Christian insulted the Holy Prophet in his presence. I said to him, "If I could, I would kill you".

But Hishām said, "Leave alone our friend."[1]

In another encounter, Hishām addressed Zayd and told him, "You are told to be entitled for caliphate while you are no one but the son of a slave woman not being competent for this task".

In response Zayd said, "Ismā'īl was also the same as me, on the other hand, Isḥāq like you was not born from a slave woman but before Allāh he was superior to Isḥāq and his descendants were the best among people".[2] Such an encounter implies that Zayd already thought of caliphate. It is said that he set forth his rebellion with his brother Imām Bāqir (a), but it is known that Imām Bāqir (a) had departed his life at least six years prior to that.

Somewhere else, Hishām to insult Imām Bāqir(a) asked Zayd, ما فعل أخوك البقرة "What is your brother, Baqara (the cow) doing?"

In response Zayd said, سماه رسول الله باقراً وتسميه البقرة لقد اختلفتما اذاً "Our holy prophet called him Bāqir, why are you calling him Baqara? You are at variance with him in this regard."[3]

Anyhow, Hishām sent Zayd to Iraq to call on Yūsuf, but since he was apprehensive of him, he wrote a letter to Khālid saying that to let him not stay there even for an hour owing to the fact that he had a great power to attract the residents thereof to himself.[4]

It is worth saying that once Zayd departed Damascus, Hishām said, "I swear by Allāh that he will run wild".[5] Resolving the problems arousing from Khālid's confession, Zayd remained in Kūfa and others who were wrongfully arrested went back to Medina.

ZAYD IBN 'ALĪ IN KŪFA

Kūfa, the city center of Iraq, was once also the center of caliphate in which many tribes resided. Among the Islamic cities, it was Kūfa that was of

---

[1]. Taysīr al-maṭālib, p.109

[2]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.286; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.v, p.225, vol.7, p.139, vol.4, p.117; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.3, p.287; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.206; 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.255; al-Ḥūr al-'ayn, p.189; Tarikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.2, p.325

[3]. 'Uyūn al-akhbār, vol.1, p.212; Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.7, p.132. vol.3, p. 286; 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.194

[4]. Tarikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.2, p.325

[5]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.XV, p.275

great threat to the Umayyads accordingly. It was under tightened security and military measures.

When Zayd left Hishām, he said to him, يا زيد اخرج حيث شئت ولاتدخل الكوفه[1] "O Zayd! go anywhere you want but do not enter Kūfa."

He also had said the same to Yūsuf.[2] As said before, Zayd stayed in Kūfa for a while after he put an end to his dispute with Khālid Ibn 'Abd Allāh. Every day Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar encouraged him to leave Kūfa as soon as possible but each time he refrained from doing so under various pretexts. Once he said he was about to leave or he wanted to buy something but finally he was forced to leave there.[3] According to Ya'qūbī, Zayd who was expelled from Kūfa came there once again for he was not under strict control.[4] In a quotation from Ibn A'tham, it is read that the soldiers of Ibn 'Umar accompanied him up to "Manṭiqa al-Ghudayb" and went back to Kūfa.[5] Following them, Zayd stayed there for four months.[6]

Another quotation indicates that the Shi'ite Muslims were in touch with him. His friends who were irritated by the Kūfiyāns' unfaithfulness[7] wanted to leave Medina so the rebellion has not been taken seriously. According to Zayd who was, on one hand, pressurized by Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar and, on the other hand, not so deeply concerned about the rebellion set out for Medina. Feeling that they lost golden opportunities, the Shi'ite Muslims of Kūfa chased him and intercepted him in Qādisiyya. They asked him to return to Kūfa to overthrow the Umayyads with their collaboration.

They said, "O Zayd, the son of Allāh's Prophet, why are you leaving Kūfa while you will have hundreds of thousand of swordsmen prepared to fight with the Umayyads?"[8]

They went on to say, "The number of the soldiers of Damascus in Kūfa would not suffice and it was only Hamdān or Midhhadj tribe that could conquer them."[9] Then Zayd accepted to return to Kūfa once the Shi'ite Muslims gave an undertaking to support him.[10]

---

1. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.236
2. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.488
3. Ibid. vol.v, p.487; Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.91
4. Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.2, p.326
5. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.111
6. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.488
7. Ibid. vol.v, pp.488,489; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.2, p.233
8. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.11; al-Fakhrī, p.132; Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.91
9. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.287
10. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.91

Zayd entered Kūfa secretly in such a way that Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar was not informed about it for a long period. Thereafter, he came to know about it since Hishām who was told about his arrival told him about it too.[1]

Zayd stayed in Kūfa for over ten months and spent two months out in Baṣra.[2] During this period, Zayd who hid in different houses[3] asked many to join him and he could not be found by the Umayyads for either they were not able to find his hiding place or they were totally unaware of his arrival there. It is said that Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar could not believe at first that he had returned to Kūfa in spite of all warnings on the part of Hishām about Zayd's riot. He said, "Zayd is a man of wisdom who will never get himself into hot water".[4] Being informed both about Kūfiyāns' readiness for uprising and the support of Iraqi Ahl Sawād, the farmers of the cultivated lands surrounding Kūfa and Iraq, Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar commanded to check the way saying that all individuals should be frisked lest any letter of Zayd might be sent somewhere else.[5]

Naṣr Ibn Khuzayma was one of the pre-eminent supporters of Zayd. He lived in his house for a while during which the Shi'ite Muslims from different places came there to visit him.[6] Another hiding place of him was the house of a woman from Azd tribe who, later on, married him.[7] Other happenings subsequent to his death divulge the fact that he had another wife as well as three children in that city.

Those points over which people had paid allegiance to Zayd, later on, turned to be the basis of the subsequent riots of this kind such as that of the penitents and Mukhtār's.

إنا ندعوكم إلى كتاب الله وسنة نبيّه (ص) وجهاد الظالمين والدفع عن المستضعفين وإعطاء المحرومين وقسم هذا الفيء بين اهله بالسواء وردّ الظالمين وإقفال المجمر ونصرنا اهل البيت علي من نصب لنا وجهل حقنا[8]

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.504

[2]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.92; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.273; 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.256

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.237; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.492

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.231

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.114

[6]. Ibid. vol.8, p.112

[7]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.492; al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.113

[8]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.292; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, pp.237,238; Balādhurī instead of saying "Iqfāl al-mudjammar" had said "Ifḍāl al-muḥammara". Maḥmūdī, a researcher, in a footnote wrote, "If this word is right, it signifies the restortion of the Non-Arabs' rights, since "Muḥmara refers to Ḥamrā'" whose rights had been violated. See, Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.238

"We enjoin you to follow both Qur'ān and the Sunna of the Prophet, fight against the oppressor, defend the oppressed, divide booties among its real owners equally, and finally support Ahl al-Bayt against their foes."

The same statements were quoted by Ibn A'tham.[1] He also referred to one of the letters found in a way by the soldiers of Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar in which he had addressed individuals saying, "You are not aware of what had happened to you. There surely is a sedition in your religion and volatility in your livelihood. Bloodshed and plunder your share from the state treasury. I enjoin you to follow Qur'ān and Sunna, defend the oppressed, fight against the oppressed who had usurped the rights of Ahl al-Bayt."[2]

In his bidding, Zayd underlined points some of which were religious and financial ones. He also accentuated cruelties that Ahl al-Bayt had endured. Since the residents of Kūfa were still dubious about what they had undertaken, Zayd paid allegiance to them not so easily.[3]

During this period of his life, Zayd wrote letters to those fascinated to Ahl al-Bayt expressing the cruelties they endured to stimulate them to fight. In one of those letters he wrote, "Do not say we rebelled غضباً لكم "rather say you ran wild."[4] غضباً لله ولرسوله

To secure allegiance from individuals, Zayd dispatched his agents to other cities. For instance, he sent Yazīd Ibn Abī Ziyād to Raqqa [5], Madā'in as well as Wāsiṭ. Some of the residents of those cities joined him and that was why Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar had the gates as well as the roads thereof checked strictly.[6] Zayd also sent Ubdat Ibn Kuthayyir and Ḥasan Ibn Sa'd to Khurāsān.[7]

From among scholars and jurisprudents taking part in Zayd's riot either directly or indirectly, one can name Abū Ḥanīfa, one of the eminent jurisprudents and experts in religion in Iraq. Politically speaking, during 'Abbāsids and Umayyads's, he opposed them. During the former time, he assisted Nafs Zakiyya and in the latter time, he aided Zayd. He was from among the Murji'ites and could not stop supporting riots of this kind. Although this sect was somehow against Shi'ism, it basically was a revolutionary movement. It has been proven in many sources that he was

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.113

[2]. Ibid. vol.8, p.116

[3]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.238

[4]. Ibid. vol.II, p.238

[5]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.99

[6]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.240

[7]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.100

from among the Murdji'ites.[1] Due to the same participation,in anti-government clashes, he has also been charged with Djahmites.[2] Murdji'ites are said to have been unwilling to equal anybody to Zayd.[3] As previously mentioned, the Djahmites originated from Djahm Ibn Ṣafwān who himself is one of the major companions of Ḥārith Ibn Suraydj, a revolutionary figure of Khurāsān. Of couse, Abū Ḥanīfa was once forced by Manṣūr to take care of some business.[4] Muḥammad Ibn Dja'far Ibn Muḥammad (a) indirectly acknowledged the report about his role in Zayd's uprising.[5]

Zamakhsharī is quoted as saying that Abū Ḥanīfa incited people to take part in Zayd's uprising.[6]

Balādhurī has witten, "When Zayd sent for Abū Ḥanīfa, he was shocked and said that who among jurisprudents had accepted his call. He was told, Salama Ibn Kuhayl, Yazīd Ibn Abī Ziyād, Hishām Barīd, Abū Hāshim Rammānī and a number of others." Abū Ḥanīfa said, "I have no authority of rebellion."; however, he sent some money for Zayd to be spent for strengthening his troops.[7]

Iṣfahānī also quoted in the same way from Abū Ḥanīfa saying that, "I have some money, you can use it for yourself and your companions for buying armour and weapons." He then gave some money to one of Zayd's slaves to be taken to him.[8]

Manṣūr Ibn al-Mu'tamir is among the jurisprudents who provoked the people to help Zayd.[9]

It is said about him, فيه تشيع قليل[10] "He holds in himself a bit of Shi'ism."

Some have introduced him among the Khashabids, a title given to Mukhtār's companions.[11] Interestingly, Zayd was even attached to Zuhrī

---

[1]. Djāmi' Bayān al-'ilm, vol.2, p.182; Tārīkh Djurdjān, p.111; al-Madjrūḥīn, vol.3, p.63; al-Ma'ārif, p.268. There is a detailed discussion in this regard in the book entitled "Murdji'a, Tārīkh wa Andīshih".

[2]. Tārīkh Baghdād, vol.II, p.179; Tārīkh Djurdjān, p.225

[3]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.87

[4]. Nūr al-qabas, p.308

[5]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.99

[6]. al-Kashshāf, p.232

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.239

[8]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, pp.99-100

[9]. Loc.Cit.

[10]. Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ, vol.I, p.143

[11]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.VI, p.337

who was a learned man affiliated with the Umayyads and asked him to rebel with Zayd.

Zuhrī said that he would not do so as long as Hishām was alive, but adding that once Walīd was in power, he would be ready to do so.[1]

Zuhrī was one of the closest people to Hishām, still somewhere it is narrated that when Zayd' head was sent to Hishām, Zuhrī said, "This family had been engulfed due to their haste."

Then the narrator says, "I questioned him whether they could come to power or not."

Zuhrī replied, "Yes, I heard 'Alī Ibn Ḥusayn(a) quoting Fāṭima from the Prophet who said, المهدي من ولدك[2] "Mahdī is from my descendants."

Another one paying allgiance to Zayd was Hilāl Ibn Ḥabāb, Madā'in's judge.[3] It is uncertain whether Salama Ibn Kuhayl participated in Zayd's riot or not.[4]

A'mash was one of the Iraqi jurisprudents who had Shi'istic inclinations.

'Uthmān Ibn 'Umayr said, "Zayd sent me to A'mash to ask him for help."

In response, he said, "I am cognizant of Zayd's virtues better than you. Give him my best regards and say that I am not sure whether people will help you or not, but I would join you if I had three hundred people accompanying me."[5]

Apart from those paying allegiance to Zayd in Madā'in, Baṣra, Wāsiṭ, Riy, Mūṣil, Khurāsān, Djurdjān and Djazīra,[6] fifteen thousand others have been mentioned too.

There were many prominent figures among those paying allegiance to Zayd.

Mas'ūdī said, "Zayd ran riot in Kūfa while the noblemen and Qur'ān readers allied with him[7] although it is not obvious how many joined him once the war was launched.

There were also some of the Khāridjites from among those paying allegiance. Accordingly, it is necessary to explain that Zayd in essence

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.239

[2]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, pp.97-98

[3]. Ibid. p.99

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.239

[5]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.100; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.239

[6]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.491; al-Fakhrī, pp.132-133; Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn p.92

[7]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.207

intended to absorb different groups by acting openly. Afterwards, this will be discussed in detail. Evidence of some kind indicates that the Khāridjites, too, like other groups wanted to take advantage of Zayd's position and of course how many groups there were is not clear.

Balādhurī says, "When Zayd came to Kūfa, the Shi'ite Muslims surrounded him and the Khāridjites came up to him as well insofar as the whole people from Madā'in, Baṣra and ... who paid allegiance to him numbered 15000.[1] Ibn 'Inba, originally a Zaydids, quoted the same thing.[2]

Ḥimyarī, one of the Zaydids historians, in his book "Al-Di'āma", quoted Sayyid Abū Ṭālib as saying that different groups of people joined together in paying allegiance to Zayd in spite of their ideological differences in such a way that all, no matter whether they were from among the Zaydids, the Mu'tazilites or the Murdji'ites, were equally interested in doing so.[3] The very same author had touched upon the presence of various sects in that riot. This implies that the residents of Kūfa left him while if the Khāridjites were there they would surely support him.

أأبا حسين لو شراة عصابة علقتك كان لوردهم اصدار

"O 'Alī! The Khāridjites who challenge you are not those who can survive when facing you."[4]

So it implicitly indicates that the Khāridjites did not participate in that rebellion; nevertheless, they emotionally supported it.

ZAYD IBN 'ALĪ'S CLASH WITH THE UMAYYADS' FORCES

In an extensive search to locate the hiding place of Zayd, Yūsuf paid one of his servants some money to go within the Shi'ite Muslims and introduce himself as one of the Ahl al-Bayt's devotees coming from Khurāsān. He had decided to find Zayd's whereabouts in this way.[5] He also at Hishām's command gathered all people together in the mosque and made them one by one to take an oath to disclose Zayd's hiding place if they knew it.[6]

Measures of this kind made Zayd revolt at least one week sooner than the expected time. At a Tuesday evening, once the riot was started at Yūsuf's command all those suspected of backing Zayd as well as the nobles

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.237

[2]. 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.256

[3]. al-Ḥūr al-'ayn, pp.185,186

[4]. Ibid. p.187

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.244; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.505

[6]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.232

and renowned figures of the city were summoned to a mosque then his agents said that they would kill whosoever stayed out of mosque no matter whether they were Arabs or not. Accordingly, all were forced to go there.[1] Such an action prevented people from joining Zayd.[2] Then at Wednesday night that was very cold, Zayd along with seventeen others left the house of Mu'āwiya Ibn Isḥāq Ibn Zayd Ibn Ḥāritha and lit a huge fire. The door of the mosque was still locked and the government agents let no one out, they were all crying", "Allāh Akbar (God is Great) and those able to join Zayd did so.[3]

The number of those who joined him that night and the day after is not distinct. Based on some sources, they were 400 [4] or 220 [5] people and based on some others, they were 300.[6] According to 'Awāna, they were 250 people.[7] What another quotation reveals is that there were 400 accompanying Zayd but the number of them reduced to 300 or less.[8] Sa'īd Ibn Khaytham who was on the side of Zayd said that they had been 500.[9]

Since Abu l-Faradj Iṣfahānī et al had a lengthy discussion regarding events of a two-day clash, it is not necessary to mention them once again, so just those of prime importance are to be touched upon.

"Yā Manṣūr, Amit, Amit" was a slogan being chosen by Zayd in his riot which was the same slogan in the war of Badr being chosen by the Holy Prophet. It was Zayd himself who said this was the very same slogan being chanted by the Holy Prophet there.[10] By the very same reason, he selected the same in his riot [11] and it, later on, came to be used in other riots. Observing that the Kūfiyāns again repeated what they had done to Ḥusayn (a); seizing to support him, Zayd said, فعلوها حسينيه[12] "They treated me just in the same way they had treated Ḥusayn (a)"

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.2, p.243; Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.92; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.499

[2]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.100

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.117; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.243; see, Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.499

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.243

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.118; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.500; they are numbered 218 in this source, Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.2, p.244

[6]. 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.257

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.249

[8]. loc.cit.

[9]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.95

[10]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.14, p.133

[11]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.92; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.246; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.499; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.2, p.106

[12]. Tārīkh Mukhtaṣar al-duwal, p.161

As referred before, the Kūfiyāns were hasty; on one hand, they made a decision very soon and, on the other hand, they regretted what they had done even sooner. This time in contrast it was not the matter of treachery since they were all besieged in mosque not being able to join him. Being severely in need of help in that predicament, Zayd could not justify their absence and said, لا والله ، ما هذا لمن بايعنا بعذر[1] "This is not a justification for those paying allegiance to us."

From the very beginning steps of their riot, Zayd had repeatedly reminded Naṣr Ibn Khuzayma, one of his devotees, of what had happened to Ḥusayn in Karbalā by stating, فعلوها حسينيه "But Naṣr said, "People are surrounded in the mosque and are not able to leave there."

Then, they resolved to launch an attack on the mosque to set the people free.[2] The Umayyads troops on the roof of the mosque did not let them open the door of the mosque by throwing stones on both the people inside and Zayd's forces outside.[3] Striving to reach the door of the mosque, Zayd's forces shouted, يا أهل المسجد اخرجوا من الذل إلي العز ومن الضلالة إلي الهدي[4] "O people of mosque! Turn to exaltation guidance from humiliation and deviation."

At that time, it was probable that even individuals being able to help, refrained to doing so. As said before, those who were surrounded in the mosque at least could have an excuse but the rest who had concealed themselves in their housees due to a fear of the government's agents were to blame for such treachery. In Kunāsa where Zayd was extremely in need of help other than two or so no one else helped him.[5]

Accepting the majority of the people being surrounded in the mosque, Zayd said, أين الباقون لا يخرجون إلينا؟[6] "Where art survivors to rush to us."

Ibn A'tham referred in his speeche to those staying in their houses while they heard his cry of help.[7]

---

[1]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.93

[2]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.94; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.247; al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.119; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, pp.500 –501

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.120; Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.94

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.247

[5]. Ibid. vol.2, p.246

[6]. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.119

[7]. Ibid. vol.8, p.119

In contrast to Karbalā's event, the main opponents of Zayd in this riot were the forces of Damascus sent to Kūfa in such critical situations. Zayd managed to kill most of them in his two-day clash but it did not suffice him since the Damascus army was composed of 12000 soldiers.[1] It was such a great army that the soldiers standing in lines could not move easily.[2] Being informed about what Zayd had done, Hishām dispatched 8000 soldiers to Iraq to fight along with Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar.[3]

It is said that the women in Kūfa asked Zayd to let them go to war. In reply, he said that he was disappointed of the men much less the women.[4] Once someone, who was from Damascus, said abusive words to Fāṭima (a). Weeping bitter tears, Zayd said, أما أحد يغضب لفاطمة بنت رسول الله[5] "Is there not anyone who may share wrath of Fāṭima's, daughter of the Messenger (s)!"

Zayd's problems were doubled when Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar 1300 of his skilled archers, known as "Al-Qīqāniyya" who were apparently from Sind. They killed the remainders of Zayd's army.[6]

Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar had paid someone 1000 Dīnārs to behead Zayd Ibn 'Alī.[7]

Ibn A'tham said, "Zayd fought bravely just the same as his grandfather, Ḥusayn (a) when all of a sudden an arrow pierced his forehead.[8] Then he was sent to the house of someone from Hamdān tribe, one of the Shi'ites tribes in Iraq. Pulling the arrow out of his forehead, he passed away.[9] When Zayd was martyred, he was 42 years old [10] and it was only after his martyrdom when the doors of the mosque were opened to public.[11]

After Zayd's martyrdom, Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar searched for his body to send his head for Hishām. Based on some different evidence, Zayd's servant who was from Sind or another servant or Ḥadjdjām was brought to him and he was someone who pulled the arrow out of his head, making known Zayd's

---

1. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.95
2. 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.257
3. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.248
4. Ibid. vol.2, p.247
5. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.96
6. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.246; Iṣfahānī in his book "Maqātil" called them "Nadjdjāriyya".
7. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p. 248
8. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.121
9. Ibid. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.250
10. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.88
11. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.251

burial place, to Yūsuf.[1] When they found his body, they sent his head for Hishām, then hung him in Kunāsa. Naṣr Ibn Khuzayma, Mu'āwiya Ibn Isḥāq Ibn Zayd Ibn Hāritha and Ziyād Ibn 'Abd Allāh Fihrī, Zayd's devotee, were all hanged too.[2]

Being furious at the Kūfiyāns, Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar threatened them when they were in the mosque and hurled abusive words at Ahl al-Bayt. He also ordered all the houses to be searched. After that, they either killed or burnt to death all the captives and the injured.[3]

They also apprehended Zayd's wife, and after making her naked, they whipped her to death.[4] 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ya'qūb whose daughter had married Yaḥyā Ibn Zayd was also killed.[5] Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar also whipped a woman 500 lashes that had told her mother to harbor Zayd's daughter. He also ruined many houses.[6] He ordered to cut the limbs of another woman who had helped Zayd and her husband was also killed.[7] Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar had ordered four hundreds of his soldiers to watch Zayd's dead body and at night 100 soldiers did so.[8] Upon hearing about Zayd's martyrdom after four years, Walīd Ibn Zayd ordered to burn his body then either to spatter its ashes around or throw to the Euphrates.[9] He had a handmaid and three children of hers in Kūfa. They were all given to Faḍl Ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān who was one of the sons of 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib.[10]

Although Hishām was angry because of Zayd's riot, he ordered not to cut Kūfiyāns' grants[11] while regarding the Medinans and Meecans he forbidenned it for one year.[12] He also ordered his governor in Baṣra, Qāsim Ibn Muḥammad Thaqafī to send those who were from among the Hāshimites in Iraq back to Medina. He ordered the governor of Medina not to let some

---

[1]. 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.257; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.207; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.503; al-Futūḥ, vol.VIII, p.122; Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyin, p.97; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, pp.250-252

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.122

[3]. Ibid. vol.8, p.123; see, Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.504

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.123; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.255

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.255

[6]. Ibid. vol.II, p.255

[7]. Loc.Cit.

[8]. Ibid. vol.II, p.256

[9]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.207; 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.258; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.257; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.538

[10]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.258

[11]. al-Futūḥ, vol.VIII, p.124; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.259

[12]. al-Aghānī, vol.VII, p.22

specific individuals go out of the city. These individuals who were released on bail were asked to report once a week they were inside the city.

In this regard Faḍl Ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān wrote these verses,

كلّما حدثــوا بأرض نعيقا ضمنوناً السجون أو سيرونا
اشخصونا إلى المدينة أسرى لا كفاهم ربي الذين يحذرونا [1]

"Whensoever a cry is heard on Earth, we are either in prison or about to move. We were captured and sent to Medina. May Allāh not satisfy the demands of those scare us."

Ibn Abi l-Zanād, someone affiliated with the Umayyads, who was known as "Faqih al-Madīna" stated that in comparison to the Umayyads' caliphs no one hated bloodshed like Hishām, but Zayd's uprising caused him heay losses, so he could not keep calm until Zayd was decapitated.[2]

Under no circumstances, as it was said, were people completely at ease but during Hishām's time in which only Zayd's uprising in some parts of Kūfa had turned there in a state of chaos until he was killed.[3] Quite obvious, it was untrue since during that period, the Khāridjites revolted several times. At the same time, the people of Khurāsān who were furious at the Umayyads ran wild under the leadership of Ḥārith Ibn Suraydj, so how is it possible to say that it was a peaceful age?

Zayd's action, as it was told by Ya'qūbī, made the Shi'ite Muslims in Khurāsān openly disagree the Umayyads by stating their hideous cruelties and revile to all what they had done to Ahl al-Bayt. Accordingly, they could attract lots of supporters.[4]

ZAYDISM, SHI'ISM AND ZAYD IBN 'ALĪ (A)

Previously, it was said that Zaydism, a deviation in Shi'ism, initiated a gap between the Twelve-Imām Shi'ite Muslims and the Zaydids to such an extent that during the last years of Imām Ṣādiq's time, they both accused each other of hideous things.

Accepting not that Zayd was the real founder of Zaydism, one can say that he played a significant role in its formation and this is the most important thing to be discussed. One of the basic principles Zaydism depending on and was expressed in various ways, was that despite the superiority of Ahl al-Bayt over others and only 'Alī (a) and Ḥasanayn, Imām

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.VII, p.165

[2]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.v, p.326

[3]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.II, p.125

[4]. Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.2. p.326

Ḥasan and Imām Ḥusayn (a) have been selected by Allāh for Imamate, they were of the opinion that whosoever from among Ahl al-Bayt rises up against the cruel, he shall deserve to be Imām. Such attitude indicates that Zaydism did not consider Imamate the same as the Twelve-Imām Shi'ite Muslims an important matter and even they were lenient with Shiykhs that is Abū Bakr and 'Umar. They were of the opinion that it was true that they never let 'Alī (a) become a caliph and this was just a problem.

Such leniency that had its own theological and juridical impacts led to the expansion of ties between the Zaydids and the Sunnites scholars having Shi'ism inclinations. For instance, the Zaydids were completely affected by Mu'tazilites theologically. They also came to endorse Abū Ḥanīfa's school of thought which was influential in Iraq. Since they were indifferent towards Imamate, they could have a good relationship with the Sunnis. As a result, there remained not more than a handful of juridical decrees intact. It would be a simplistic attitude to assume that the Zaydids followed the Sunnis completely, they instead struggled hard for centuries to maintain their Shi'ites identities.

Whether such attitude regarding Imamate has emanated from Zayd's ideas as well as his conducts or not, discussion goes far in detail. The latest books concerning Zayd's life, the main of which are "Zayd al-Shahīd" from 'Allāma Muqarram and "Sīrah wa Qiyām Zayd Ibn 'Alī" from Mr. Karīmān, all are written in such a way to show that Zayd did believe in the Imamate of 'Alī (a) and his sons. In the above-mentioned books, there is no trace of criticizm regarding Zayd, instead there are abundant quotations all praising him and reflecting his strong belief in twelve Imāms. Although this was true based on some evidence, more attention should be paid if it were supposed to say that it was quite true since some other evidence, on the other hand, contradict the previous ones and this should not be overlooked so simply, rather it is intended to overlook them as a precaution or, اذكرو موتاكم بالخير[1] "Recollect a good memory of thy dead ones."

Something written in many sources was an argument between Zayd and the Twelve-Imām Shi'ite Muslims during the very beginning steps of his riot about his attitude towards the Shiykhs. The Sunnites sources had tried hard to quote it in line with their religious tendencies, but this should not make us disregard it completely.

When a group of eminent figures from among those paying allegiance to him asked of his opinion towards the Shiykhs, he said, "May Allāh bless

---

[1]. According to Ash'arī, وجميع فرق الزيدية مذاهبهم في الاحكام والفرائض والمواريث مذاهب العامة "Religions of all Zaydyids sects in rules are obligations and inherited religion of all people" al-Maqālāt wa l-firaq, p.19

them, never have I heard Ahl al-Bayt disgust them. Accordingly, I would not do this either".

"So why do you want to take Ahl al-Bayt's revenge of them who had violated your rights?", they asked.

Zayd said, "The only thing I can say is that they did violate our right, but this could not make me be an unbeliever. Although they usurped the throne and did not follow either Qur'ān or Sunna, they were fair to people".

They asked, "Why they are not cruel to you like the previous rulers. Why do you intend to wage a war against them?"

In reply he said, "Those rulers were not the same as them. They were cruel not only to me and you but to themselves as well. I enjoin you to adhere to Qur'ān and the prophet's Sunna as well as eliminate the heresies. If you accept me, you would be prosperous. If not, you should await the consequence".

This reply made them not pay allegiance to Zayd. Taking into account the fact that at that time Imām Muḥammad Ibn 'Alī al-Bāqir (a) was not alive, the narrator quoted them as saying, "Now Dja'far (a) should take the place of his father and we do not follow Zayd".

It is said that Zayd called them "Rāfiḍa" (the Disavowers) but they themselves are of the opinion that it was Mughīra Ibn Sa'īd who had done this rather than Zayd.[1]

The same event was quoted by Ḥimyarī as well but because of his extremist Zaydids's stance he stated that the Prophet himself had called them the Disavowers. This would be discussed later.

Ḥimyarī went on to say that the Disavowers adrressed Zayd saying, "The Umayyads, in restoring your rights, were just the same as the Shiykhs.[2] In al-Futūḥ, also there is the same statement from them adding that the Disavowers thereafter went to Dja'far Ibn Muḥammad and told him what had happened to them but he asked them to go back to Zayd.[3]

Balādhurī stated the same point of what the opponents had said, "Subsequent to Muḥammad Ibn 'Alī (a) our Imām is Bāqir, his son."

Zayd send someone to Imām Bāqir (a) to ask him whether he wanted to run a riot or not.

They said, "He might practice dissimulation[4] and as a result, they would not join him."

---

[1]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.498

[2]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.v, p.498; al-Ḥūr al-'ayn p.185

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, pp.116-117

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.240

It is worth stating that it was a false quotation since Imām Bāqir (a) at that time was not alive. It is probable that in the very same utterance, the word Djaʻfar had been used instead of Abū Djaʻfar.

One may not doubt about such an argument, on the other hand, it is quite obvious that the historians attempted to demonstrate Zayd as having non-Shiʻites inclinations to overcome the Disavowers who were from among the Twelve-Imām Shiʻite Muslims.

They altered the very same happening to such an extend that another writer went on to say, "The Disavowers shot his forehead, then they hung him and compelled him to cut the hands of his wife. They did the same to ʻAlī, to Ḥasan, to Ḥusayn and his children.[1]

Some others quoted Zayd as saying, البراءة من خلفاء الثلاثة البراءة من علي وعكسه ايضاً[2] "Dissociation from three caliphs equals that from ʻAlī and vice versa."

Despite the fact that Zayd did not accept caliph III, anyhow, there are some quotations in other sources that all indicate that Zayd called the opponents the Disavowers.[3]

Two further points in this regard should be taken into account. At first, it should be known whether Zayd did make that statement only for attracting others and because of dissimulation or it was really his own attitude. The second point is that whether the Shiʻite Muslims were called the Disavowers merely because of the above-mentioned reasons or there might be some other reasons as well.

At first, Zayd's dissimulation should be discussed. Even if we suppose that Zayd did not believe in the Imamate of other Imāms after Ḥusayn (a), it seems impossible that Zayd had been praising the first or second caliph in spite of the efforts on the part of the Sunnites narrators, in this respect, made to show Zayd did praise them. There are many statements that indicate the Shiʻite Muslims disapproved of them. Another point is that, as it was mentioned by Zayd's opponents too, the illegality of those two caliphs was the basis of Shiʻism. They were of the opinion that their caliphate was a pure injustice. This opinion, later on, became the source of other political mistakes such as the formation of the Umayyads. As mentioned before, by Zayd's opponents, Zayd could not have said so. If he did not really accept their legitimacy, so there might be a specific reason for him to approve

---

[1]. ʻAbd al-Djalīl Rāzī Qazwīnī (al-Naqḍ, p.375) this quotation is from "Baʻḍ Faḍāʼiḥ al-rawāfiḍ". The very same statements being uttered out of prejudice is also in "Minhādj al-Sunna", vol.II, p.126

[2]. Tārīkh Baghdād, vol.2, p.89

[3]. ʻUmdat al-ṭālib, p.257; Nasab Quraysh, p.61; Tārīkh Mukhtaṣar al-duwal, p.116; al-Muḥabbar, p. 483; Lisān al-ʻarab, vol.7, p.158; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.246

them. Just for a while, Zayd who had ran wild in Kūfa thought whether it was true or not about mobilizing all to oppose the Umayyads. In that situation, he attempted not to disperse a large number of people who are able to help him by taking position against 'Umar and 'Uthmān. He even expected the Khāridjites's support and it was quite obvious that if he had really divulged his stance, he would have dispersed all the opponents of the Umayyads who were not the Shi'ite Muslims. On the other hand, he might have mistaken counting on those forces for coming to power, but he surely could not rise up without their help.

In spite of what had been mentioned above, it can not be said for sure that Zayd did not believe in what he had said but it is probable that the Shi'ite Muslims who left him could not perceive that dissimulation. On the other hand, there are some evidence in this regard one of which is the cautious measures taken by the 'Abbāsids who just the same as the 'Alawites were Shi'ite Muslims. After coming to power, they still had the same position towards the caliphs and it was reflected in the utterances of Saffāḥ from the very beginning of their caliphates.[1] Attempting to hold the Banū 'Adī and Banū Tayım (the Shiykhs' tribes) in high esteem in spite of what the 'Alawites had desired[2], Manṣūr sowed the seed of hatred between the 'Alawites and the 'Abbāsids. But once Sayyid Ḥimyarī asked him to cut the grants of those tribes, when Mahdī 'Abbāsī was heir apparent, he did so. This alone is an indication of heresy among the 'Abbāsids let alone Zayd and the 'Alawites.

Another evidence regarding Zayd's dissimulation is an utterance of someone syaing, "Being injured, Zayd siad, أين سائلي عن ابي بكر وعمر، هما أقاماني هذا المقام[3] "Thou ask me of Abū Bakr and 'Umar, beware that they let me hold this position."

If this statement is true, it will verify Zayd's dissimulation political outcome of which was quite obvious for him. For the very same reason, the Khāridjites, the Murdji'ites and the Zaydids all participated in his uprising.[4] Taking the above mentioned points into account, it can be said that Zayd's dissimulation, later on, turned to be the corner-stone of the Zaydids.

One further point worthy of stating is that Zayd was said to call the Twelve-Imām Shi'ite Muslims, the Disavowers since they left him as soon as they became aware of what he had said about the Shiykhs.

---

[1]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, vol.7, pp.161,162

[2]. al-'Uyūn wa l-ḥadā'iq, p.197

[3]. Tabṣirat al-'awām, pp.34,35 from the book "al-Alfāẓ" by 'Abd al-Raḥmān Hamadānī

[4]. al-Ḥūr al-'ayn, p.185

It should also be mentioned that Rafḍ means "relinquishing the limitations". It also refers to an army that has left their leader. Each division of this army is then called "Rafiḍa", the Disavowers. It also refers to someone who has set his cattle free to go whereever they want to. "Ibl al-Rāfiḍa" is also referred to the camels that go to pasture without shepherd.[1]

This term is referred to the Twelve-Imām Shi'ite Muslims who did not accept the first and second caliphs, but were approved by those who had accepted their caliphate.

Ash'arī, in this regard, had said, "The Shi'ite Muslims are called the Disavowers since they rejected the caliphate of both 'Umar and Abū Bakr."[2]

Relinquishing themselves from all restrictions, in contrast to them, the literalists, followed different rulers. In history, the distinctive feature of the Disavowers is that they did not accept the caliphate of the Shiykhs and criticized them repeatedly since they had violated the rights of Imāms.[3]

The writer of Tabṣara al-'Awām in this regard had stated, "Once the enemy was asked about Rafḍ and Rāfiḍī, he should answer, "It means giving up, throwing and in common usage, the Disavower is someone who believes in the Imamate of 'Alī not Abū Bakr. Since this word means giving up, so they can be called the Disavowers. They relinquished the credal error and followed what was gospel truth. And if you want "Rafḍ" as an expression, it implies that they never tilted towards Imamate of Abū Bakr and this is just praise rather than reproach.[4]

Sayyid Ḥimyarī in front of Qāḍī Bawār who had rejected his witness and called him a Disavower said, و نحن على رغمك رافض لاهل الضلالة والمنكر[5] "In spite of what you want, I am a Disavower, someone who rejects aberation as well as unlawful."

Some points should be taken into account regarding why Zayd called the Twelve-Imām Shi'ite Muslims Disavowers.

The first point is that in contrast to what was mentioned before, in al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq from Ash'arī, one of the first scripts about various sects in Shi'ism, this term denotes something else. This is the story, Once Mughīra Ibn Sa'īd who was from exaggerators said that he opposed Nafs Zakiyya in front of the Twelve-Imām Shi'ite Muslims and they

---

[1]. Lisān al-'arab, vol.VII, p.157

[2]. Maqālāt al-islāmiyyīn, vol.1, p.89; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.2, p.245; al-Khiṭaṭ al-miqrīziyya, vol.4, p.73

[3]. Mīzān al-i'tidāl, vol.3, pp. 249,268,324,325; al-Shi'r wa l-shu'arā', p.316

[4]. Tabṣirat al-'awām, p.32

[5]. al-Fuṣūl al-mukhtāra, pp.61-63

excommunicated him. فزعم أنهم رافضة وأنه هوالذي سماهم بهذا الاسم "He thought that they were the Disavowers and it was him who called them the Disavowers."[1]

In a quotation from Ṭabarī mentioned previously, the Shi'ite Muslims themselves had accepted this.

The second point is that in an argument between Farazdaq and Hishām Ibn 'Abd al-Malik about Imma Sadjdjād (a), Farazdaq wrote his popular poem regarding Imām, the caliph asked him, أنت أورافضي "Are you a Disavower?"

He replied, إن كان حب أهل البيت رفضاً فنعم[2] "If loving Ahl al-Bayt is equal to being a Disavower, so yes, I am a Disavower too."

Thereafter, he was sent to prison. Since this had taken place during the life of Imām Sadjdjād (a) who passed away in 95 A.H., it can he understood that this meaning of Disavower had nothing to do with what was mentioned earlier in Zayd's time. It is probable that this term was used about the Shi'ite Muslims because of its literal usage at first and then to reject the legitimacy of the two caliphs.

The third point is that this term had been used in various manners being quoted by Sha'bī regarding the Shi'ite Muslims. Since he had died years before Zayd's uprising, it can be inferred that at that time, too, the Shi'ite Muslims were called the Disavowers.

There are several quotations in this regard [3] one of which is what Sha'bī had said, أحبب آل محمد ولا تكن رافضياً "Adore Ahl al-Bayt, but do not be a Disavower."[4]

The fourth point is that as it was stated by the same scholars, individuals such as Iṣfahānī in Maqātil al-Ṭālibīn and Ibn Sa'd in Ṭabaqāt had not this quotation. So it is an indication that shows they, especially Iṣfahānī failed to accept it.

The fifth point is that Faḍl Ibn Shādhān quoted the Sunnites narrators as saying, "Ḥasan Ibn Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī (a) had said, مرقت علينا الرافضة كما مرقت الخوارج على علي[5] Ibn Ḥasan Ibn Ḥasan had died before Zayd.

It is probable that Ḥasan Ibn Ḥasan Ibn Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī was the brothre of Nafs Zakiyya who had died after him. Anyhow he, as a Zaydids, had told

---

[1]. al-Maqālāt al-firaq, pp.76,77; al-Firaq al-shī'a, p.63

[2]. al-Maḥāsin wa l-masāwī, p.213. In this quotation, 'Abd al-malik was used instead of Hishām.

[3]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.2, p.250; see, Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.7, p.186

[4]. Rabi' al-abrār, vol.1, p. 60

[5]. See, Sīrih wa qiyām Zayd Ibn 'Alī, p.216; al-Īḍāḥ, p.473 (printed in Tehran University) and see, Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.v, p.320

this. An important point is that Faḍl in his reply had considered the literal meaning of this term, in the least referring not to Zayd.

He also said, "Rafḍ هم الذين لا يرون قتال احد الا مع امام عدل عالم بما يأتي ويذر[1] "They art those who deem permissible fighting anyone joining no one but 'Alī who is well informed about all affairs."

It is anyhow certain that probably from the late 1st century onwards, this term based on its literal meaning was used to refer to the Shi'ite Muslims.

There also is a forged tradition in which the Holy Prophet had said, "At the end of time, there will appear a tribe that is called the Disavowers. They are disbelievers and you have to kill them."[2]

This statement was surely an insult. Later on, when the Zaydids cut their relationship with the Twelve-Imām Shi'ite Muslims, they used this statement when they spoke ironically about the Shi'ite Muslims. Zayd himself most likely, due to the terrible condition of that time, had used this term. For any reason this term was used and basically its literal meaning had been taken into account. The above-mentioned tradition was prevalent during Imām Ṣādiq's time as a justification for the rulers to sacrifice the Shi'ite Muslims. Accordingly, this might show that the emergence of this word dates back to the time before Zayd's uprising. It was also said that some of the Shi'ite Muslims asked Imām Ṣādiq why their enemies called them the Disavowers.

In reply, Imām said, "They did not name you so but based on what was in the Torah and Gospel, you are called the Disavowers since seventy people of Pharaoh's servants left him and embraced the religion of Moses and they were called the Disavowers by Allāh ... just the same as them, you had joined Ahl al-Bayt and obeyed Allāh's command too."[3]

By referring to the previous quotations, it can be undearstood that Imām had stressed the literal meaning of this word while calling those who had not accepted the ruling of the criminals. 'Ammār Duhnī quoted one of the companions of Imām Ṣādiq as saying the same statements before the judge of Kūfa that had called him a Disavower.[4]

Criticizing the aforesaid tradition, Faḍl Ibn Shādhān proved that it was a forged one. Since it is nonesensical to say that someone who believes in

---

[1]. al-Īḍāḥ, p.475

[2]. Mīzān al-i'tidāl, vol.3, p.237. It is said that its validity because of Ḥadjdjādj Ibn Tamīm is subject to debate; see al-Ilmām, vol.1, p.33; al-Ṣawā'iq al-muḥriqa, the first preface

[3]. Tafsīr Furāt Kūfī, p.139 (Nadjaf); Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXXXVIII, p.97-98

[4]. Biḥār al-anwār, vol.XXXXXXVIII, pp.156,157

both Allāh and His Prophet to be called an unbeliever and deserves to be killed.

He went on to say that in our view the Shi'ite Muslims- whom you call the Disavowers - disapprove Abū Bakr and 'Umar about 'Alī's excellences but they never said that both were vice-incarnated. They said 'Alī was superior to them in different ways.[1]

THE TWELVE-IMĀM SHI'ITE MUSLIMS AND ZAYD

The Twelve-Imām Shi'ite Muslims, being of the opinion that Imāms have been selected by Allāh and their obedience is requisite and had various stances regarding Zayd and his uprising. As the title implies, two points are to be discussed. Namely, the outlook of both Imāms and their companions are to be mentioned.

There are many narrations about Zayd which are difficult to be enumerated. Zayd has been approved in some. Some others had a skeptical view about him, but if we look positively at them, it can be seen that the Shi'ites Imāms were optimist towards him. Justifying his uprising, the Shi'ite Imāms were of the opinion that he could restore the rights of the oppressed if he would have been obeyed. It could not be understood from these quotations that either Zayd was triumphant in his uprising or he did so at Imām Ṣādiq's behest at all. Knowing that the uprisings of that kind were not likely to be victorious and even they were so at first, it was not clear what would happen at the end the Shi'ites Imāms did not approve those uprisings. On the other hand, martyrdom of he who adores it in an attempt to fight with the oppressor is desirable.

Shiykh Ṣadūq in this regard by narrating about Imām Riḍā (a) to praise Zayd had stated, "I will bring more traditions from other Imāms about Zayd to make the ideas of the Twelve-Imām Shi'ite Muslims regarding Zayd perceptible to all.[2] It is worth saying that none of his quotations implies that Zayd rose up at Imām's behest to bring them to power. One of those quotations which brightens Zayd's intention is to be mentioned here.

Imām Riḍā (a) quoted his father and he had quoted Imām Ṣādiq (a) as saying, رحم الله عمي زيداً ، انه دعا الي الرضا من آل محمد ولو ظفر لوفي بما دعا اليه[3] "May Allāh

---

[1]. al-Īḍāḥ, p.303 (Tehran University), for looking into this matter, refer to, Ta'līqāt (suspensions) of the late Urmawī in al-Iḍāḥ and also in the book of Naqḍ

[2]. 'Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā, vol.1, p.195

[3]. Ibid. See, Kifāyat al-athar, p.327; Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p.285; as it was mentioned by Ibn Zuhra in Ghāyat al-ikhtiṣār, فهذا الخبر هو الذي سلم زيدا منهم وجعلهم يترحّمون عليه "It was the same report that kept Zayd immune from all harnms and caused him to

forgive my uncle, he who called on others to obey "Al-Riḍā Men Āl Muḥammad". If he had been victorious, he would surely have not broken his promise."

This phrase "Al-Riḍā Men Āl Muḥammad" implies that he did not ask people to obey him. There are other quotations some of which are about Zayd's martyrdom in Kunāsa and about Imām Ṣādiq's sorrow accordingly and some others are on his approval.[1] An important point mentioned previously was Zayd's martyrdom or his defeat. Zayd's mother was said to have accused Imām of feeling envious upon hearing the news of Zayd's martyrdom from Imām some time before it.[2]

Most likely the term (لوفٍ به) implies that Zayd had not been determined first to transfer the power to the Imāms, on the other hand, to trust Zayd very much, Imām Ṣādiq (a) was of the opinion that he would surely let Imām Riḍā come to power if only he could be victorious.

Some of Imām Bāqir's hadiths regarding Zayd's virtues in available sources have been compiled by Abu l-Djārūd Mundhir, one of the leaders of the Zaydids. Accordingly, they could not be trusted completely. For example, he had quoted Imām Bāqir as saying, أما زيد فلساني الذي انطلق به[3] "But Zayd is as my tongue by which I speak."[4]

'Amr Ibn Khālid who was also one of the leaders of the Zaydids said that Imām Bāqir (a) by pointing to Zayd had said, هذا سيد اهل بيتي والطالب بأوتارهم[5] "He is the master of Ahl al-Bayt and someone who will take their revenge."

Since the narrators of such quotations were people from the Zaydids, obviously, they might not be relied.

Kashshī also had quoted Abū Ya'qūb Muqrī as saying, وكان من كبار الزيدية He also had quoted 'Amr Ibn Khālid as saying, وكان من كبار الزيدية Thereafter, Imām Bāqir's utterance previously mentioned was once again reiterated.[6]

What these narrations are to depict is that Zayd was the most important figure of Ahl al-Bayt. For instance, Imām Bāqir as said regarded Zayd's superiority to others among Ahl al-Bayt.

---

be pitied by them" This news had made the Twelve-Imām Shi'ite Muslims praise him; as a result, Zayd was secured from their harm. See, Ghāyat al-ikhtiṣār, p.128

[1]. 'Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā, vol.1, pp.194-197; Kifāyat al-athar, p.328

[2]. Ṣadūq, al-Amālī, section,10, p. 40

[3]. Qāmūs al-ridjāl, vol.4, p. 261

[4]. About the non-credibility of Abu l-Djārūd; see, Qāmūs al-ridjāl, vol.4, pp.228,230

[5]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, pp.231,232

[6]. Ibid. p.231; Qāmūs al-ridjāl, vol.4, p.266; Tanqiḥ al-maqāl, vol.1, p.468

Ḥimyarī, one of the Zaydids scholars also in his book had quoted Imām as saying, "There is no one among us comparable to Zayd."[1] And هذا سيد بني هاشم، اذا دعاكم فاجيبوه واذا استنصروكم فانصروه[2] "He is the master of the Hāshimites, you are to obey him once he calls on you and help him when he asks for help."

In spite of the fact that these statements are not inconsistent with Imām Ṣādiq's view about Zayd, since Imām did not consider him as an opportunist but a purified man just the same as his honorable forefathers, so he was sorrowful about his martyrdom, they could barely be valid. Ibn A'tham said that upon hearing the news of his martyrdom, Imām had recited this verse of Qur'ān, من المومنين رجال صدقوا ما عاهدوا الله عليه "Among the faithful, there are men who abide by their pledge to God" and equated him with individuals such as 'Ali (a) and Imām Ḥusayn (a) and ended his speech by saying, ويل لقاتلهم من جبّار الارض والسماء[3] "Woe unto their murderers from revenge of Almighty God."

Abu l-Djārūd also in the Sunnites books had said that he was a confederate of Qur'ān.[4] In the scholastic books, he was said to be not reliable.[5] Fuḍayl al-Rassān had a narration on Zayd's virtues. He was also one of the followers of Abu l-Djārūd[6] and Ibn Nadīm considered him among the Jarudites.[7]

There also is another narration in the Sunnites references indicating that some of the Disavowers had asked Imām Ṣādiq (a) about paying allegiance to Zayd. Imām said, بايعوه والله افضلنا وسيدنا وخيرنا

It was also said that the Disavowers did not let others know what Imām had said.[8] What was said in the narration shows clearly that it was not more than a fabricated one said only to beat the Shi'ite Muslims. It is a question whether the narrator was informed about it while the Disavowers had concealed it.

Similar to this, 'Amr Ibn Qāsim had said, "I went to Dja'far Ibn Muḥammad and saw a group of the Disavowers."

---

[1]. al-Ḥūr al-'ayn, pp.188-189

[2]. Ibid. p.189

[3]. al-Futūḥ, vol.8, p.125

[4]. Tanqiḥ al-maqāl, vol.1, p.467

[5]. Ibid. vol.1, pp.460-461, Ibn Nadīm quoted Imām Ṣādiq as saying, لعنه الله، فانه أعمى القلب، أعمى البصر Muḥammad Ibn Sanān said about him, ابو الجارود لم يمت حتى شرب المسكر وتولى الكافرين al-Fihrist, pp.226-227

[6]. al-Milal wa l-niḥal, vol.I, p.149; al-Maqālāt wa l-firaq, p.74, No.144

[7]. al-Fihrist, p.227

[8]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.5, p.499; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.3, p.240

Then I said, "They hate your uncle."

Imām said, "My uncle, Zayd?"

I said, "yes."

He said, "Their action is disliking Allāh." والله اقرؤنا لكتاب الله وأفقهنا في دين الله و...[1] What was said above was much the same as the narration being mentioned previously. Knowing that Zayd was a pious man seeking Allāh's satisfaction, Imām Ṣādiq by no means abhored him. Mas'ūdī, on the other hand, said that Imām Bāqir (a) had asked his brother, Zayd, not to trust the Kūfiyāns since they were well known for being treacherous, so how it is possible that Imām had asked the Shi'ite Muslims to pay allegiance to him. Imām also added out there, "Your grandfather, 'Alī (a), your uncle, Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī, and your father, Ḥusayn, have been martyred and the Kūfiyāns hurled abusive words at Ahl al-Bayt."

Then Imām informed him about what he knew regarding the Marwānids as well as the news of the 'Abbāsids ruling. But Zayd still insisted on what he wanted to do, Imām said to him, إني أخاف عليك يا أخ أن تكون غدا المصلوب بكناسة الكوفة، وودعه ابوجعفر[2] "I am afraid of finding you hung in Kunāsa of Kūfa, so Imām said farewell to him."

As it was mentioned in the aforesaid statement, Imām did not order him not to go there but advised him. Even if we do not doubt about its validity, we can understand that Imām was not optimistic about it. In quotations about Imām Bāqir's view regarding Zayd, something which should be taken into account is that Zayd had wanted to rise up before. The number of these narrations on the other hand, may reveal that the narrator had wrongly written the name of Imām Ṣādiq instead of Bāqir or Dja'far instead of Abū Dja'far.

It was also said, just the same as what Mas'ūdī had said, "Upon showing the letters that the Kūfiyāns had sent to Zayd asking him to rise up, Imām said, "Lest they might humiliate you, so do not hasten."

Zayd who got angry said, "Imām is not someone who stays at home, but he is someone who defends his territory and ...."[3]

These narrations that accuse Zayd of bringing people around himself are not compatible with what was repeatedly said by Imām Ṣādiq about, لوظفر لوفي به "In case he wins, he keeps his word" and all other approvals, an example of which is quotation from Ḥusayn Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, who lived in time

---

[1]. Tahdhīb Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.6, p.18; Fawāt al-wafayāt, vol.1, p.210; al-Khiṭaṭ al-miqrīziyya, vol.4, p.307

[2]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.206

[3]. al-Kāfī, vol.1, p.357

of Shiykh Ṭūsī, in "'Uyūn al-Mu'djizāt" which Afandī stated in his book too.

Imām Bāqir by referring to Zayd said, ترون أخي هذا والله يدعي ما ليس له ويدعو الناس الي نفسه فيجتمع عليه خلق فيؤخذ ويقتل ويُصْلب في كناسة الكوفة[1] "You will see my brother claiming something which does not belong to him. He will call on people to gather around him. Some will do so, but after a while, he would be killed and hung in Kanasa of Kūfa."

As a conclusion, what should be noted is that Imāms had praised Zayd while they had also informed him about the consequences of his action. So it can be understood that in this regard he was not after them or at least he had not asked them for a permission to rise up. Accordingly, Imāms had praised him because he was a prominent figure who wanted to overthrow the Umayyads and called on others to obey, الرضا من آل محمد 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Sayyāba was quoted as saying, "Dja'far Ibn Muḥammad gave me 1000 Dīnārs to give to the families of those being killed in his uprising. Each of them was given 4 Dīnārs. (it was also said that the family of 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr Rassān was given 4 Dīnārs).[2]

Regarding Zayd, Imām Riḍā was quoted as saying, فإنه كان من علماء آل محمد وغضِبَ لله عز وجل فجاهد أعداءه حتى قتل في سبيله[3] "He was one of the scholars of Ahl al-Bayt. Getting angry for Allāh's sake, he was martyred in his fight against His enemies."

Somewhere else, Imām Ṣādiq was said to be angry upon heating that his companions backbited Zayd.[4] He also had considered those reproaching him as being equal to those having hand in his martyrdom.[5]

The conversation between Zayd and the companions of both Imām Bāqir and Ṣādiq (a) shows another dimension of the Twelve-Imām Shi'ites view regarding him. In this regard, there are many narrations pursuit of which are documented. Prior to mentioning them, it should be noted that some of the companions of Imām Ṣādiq in Kūfa when Zayd rose up gave up supporting him once they talked to him about his uprising. This action unfolds the stance of the Twelve-Imām Shi'ite Muslims, if it could not show that of Imāms.

An interesting point is that the only one participating in Zayd's uprising from among the companions of Imām Bāqir was Sulaymān Ibn Khālid. Nadjāshī had said about him, كان قارئا فقيها وجها روي عن أبي عبد الله وأبي جعفر عليهما

---

[1]. Riyāḍ al-'ulamā', vol.2, p.337

[2]. 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.258; Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p.338

[3]. 'Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā, vol.1, pp.194-195

[4]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p.152

[5]. Nathr al-durr, vol.1, p.353

السلام، خرج مع زيد ولم يخرج معه في اصحاب ابي جعفر عليه السلام غيره، فقطعت يده وكان الذي قطعها يوسف بن عمر بنفسه[1] "Being a Qur'ān reader, jurisprudent and an eminent figure among Imām Bāqir and Ṣādiq's companions, he narrated what they had been saying. He joined Zayd while there was no one from Imām Bāqir's companions to do so but him. His hands were cut by Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar."

Shiykh Ṭūsī also had stressed that no one from the companions of Imām Bāqir (a) had participated in Zayd's uprising but him.[2] By referring to Imām Bāqir's companions, he had meant those prominent figures, not all of them. The emphasis of Nadjāshī and Ṭūsī, the most important scholars of the Shi'ite Muslims, is a strong evidence indicating that Imām Bāqir's companions were not present in Zayd's uprising. They did not do this since they had no reason for doing so. Otherwise, it should be said that either they were afraid of doing so or they did it independently without consulting Imām. Anyhow, none of these reasons are acceptable.

Another narration regarding absence of Imām Bāqir's companions in Zayd's uprising is worth mentioning. At that time, Ḥusayn Ibn Ziyād entered Medina and went to Imām Ṣādiq (a) to speak about his beliefs. Imām said that his beliefs were the true ones. He spoke about his anxiety. Imām asked him the reason.He replied, إن ظفر زيد وأصحابه فليس أحد اسوأ حالاً عندهم منا وإن ظفر بني امية، فنحن عندهم بتلك المنـزلة، قال: فقال لي: ليس عليك بأس من أولي ومن أولي[3] "Our condition would be worst of all no matter whether Zayd oercomes the Umayyads or otherwise. Imām said, "Do not worry, neither of them can harm you." This conversation reveals the fact that the Twelve-Imām Shi'ite Muslims, on one hand, were appeasing the Zaydids and, on the other hand, the Umayyads.

There had been considerable discussion between Zayd and some of the companions of Imām Ṣādiq narrated by Kashshī. Some of the main points are to be discussed. A matter of great importance was that whether there was Imām whose obedience had been necessary or not and if so who was him?

Zurāra Ibn A'yun is substantially quoted as saying, "Zayd, being before Imām Ṣādiq (a), said to me, ما تقول يا فتى في رجل من آل محمد استنصرك "What do you say to someone from Ahl al-Bayt who asks your help."

Zurāra said, إن كان مفروض الطاعة نصرته وإن كان غير مفروض الطاعة فلي أن لا أفعل "If he were supposed to be obeyed, I would help him. If not, I can avoid helping him."

---

[1]. Ridjāl al-nadjāshī, p.130; see, Tanqīḥ al-maqāl, vol.II, p.57

[2]. Ridjāl al-Ṭūsī, p.207; Ridjāl al-'Allāma Ḥillī, p.77, 'Allāma Ḥillī brought a quotation form Sa'd's book saying, "He had joined Zayd, but was saved" فمن الله عليه وتاب ورجع عن ذلك "When God faored him, he repented and avoided doing that" so in the view of some of the Shi'ites scholars, his participation in that uprising was not right because of the word "repentance" in this quotation.

[3]. al-Amālī, Shiykh Mufīd, p.33

"When Zayd went out, Imām was satisfied with my answer since he was not able to say anything else", Zurāra said.[1]

The very last part of this narration indicates that Imām disliked Zayd's uprising. The answer of Zurāra also shows his respect toward Zayd not anything else.

The late Kulaynī had also quoted a discussion between Mu'min al-Ṭāq and Zayd from some of the companions of Imām, Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn 'Īsā, 'Alī Ibn Ḥakam, Abān Ibn Taghlib and Mu'min al-Ṭāq himself.

He said, "Hiding himself from the public, Zayd asked me whether I could see him. When I went to see him, he said, "O Abū Dja'far it seems that your way is different from ours. Don't you like to join us?"

"If your brother or your father were instead of you, I would do so", I replied.

Zayd said, "I want to rise up and fight with these people. I also want you to join me".

"May I be sacrificed to you! I can not do this," I said.

"Are you withholding your life from me", Zayd said.

I said, "I will die only once. If there is another proof for Allāh on earth other than you, whosoever joins you instead of him, shall be subjugated and if there is no proof for him, it will make no difference to him whether he joins you or not."

Zayd said, "O, Abū Dja'far, When my father and I were eating food with each other, my father made it cool for me to eat. While I was treated so kindly, you tell me now that the hellfire will not have mercy on me. How is it possible for my father to tell you about (the proof) while I am not aware of it at all?"

I said to him, "He did not tell you anything about it since he was afraid that you might not approve of it and meet the hell fire. But your father told me that if I accepted him, I would behave him well. May I be sacrificed to you, are you superior to the prophets?"

"The prophets", he said.

I said, "Jacob told Josef,

قَالَ يَا بُنَيَّ لَا تَقْصُصْ رُؤْيَاكَ عَلَى إِخْوَتِكَ فَيَكِيدُوا لَكَ كَيْدًا إِنَّ الشَّيْطَانَ لِلْإِنسَانِ عَدُوٌّ مُبِينٌ.

"Alas! O son, he said, reveal not your dream to brothers for they fall in envy of you."

Your father also hid the truth from you since he was afraid of you".

---

[1]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p.153 فلما خرج، قال ابو عبدالله (ع), اخذته من بين يديه ومن خلفه وما ترکت له مخرجا

Zayd said, "Your master, he referred to Imām Ṣādiq (a), had told me that I would be killed in Medina and hung in Kunāsa. He has a book in which there is the news of my martyrdom".

Mu'min al-Ṭāq said, "Thereafter, I went to Medina and informed Imām about what had happened between us, praising me for what I had done, Imām said that I had closed all ways of reasoning to him.[1]

This narration is evidentially true and quite logical. These points mentioned by Mu'min al-Ṭāq were also taken into account by the Twelve-Imām Shi'ite Muslims. It is not intended, based on this narration, to conclude that Zayd claimed Imām rather it is stated to show that Zayd did not believe that Imām Ṣādiq (a) was to be obeyed obligatorily. The very same story was also said somewhere else. Based on this, Mu'min al-Ṭāq had reiterated his conversation with Zayd to Imām Ṣādiq (a).[2]

Quoting Zayd, Sawra Ibn Kulayb of Ṣādiqayn said, "How did you figure out that your master of the thing you say (i.e. his obedience is obligatory from God).

Sawra said, "I told him, you asked a learned person."

He said, "Tell me."

And I said, "We came to Muḥammad Ibn 'Alī, your brother, and questioned him and he gave us the answer through, قال رسول الله وقال الله عز وجل في كتابه "The prophet and God in His Book said"

When he passed away, we came to you of the Muḥammad's progeny. Some of our questioned were answered while some others remained unanswered, until we came to Dja'far, your brother's offspring, and he told us the same thing as your father, قال رسول الله وقال الله تعالى

Zayd smiled and said, "Its reason is availability of 'Alī's books to him."[3]

The same discussion happened between Abū Bakr Ḥaḍramī, 'Alqama of Imām Bāqir's companions and Zayd.

They heard Zayd as saying, ليس الامام منا من ارخى ستره انما من شهر سيفه "Imām among us isn't the one who covers himself, but he is the one who pulls his sword."

Abū Bakr Ḥaḍramī, a not-tempted person, said to Zayd, "O father of Ḥusayn! Tell me weather 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib was Imām in the time of his isolation or his pulling sword?"

Being reticent, Zayd didn't give any answers.

---

[1]. al-Kāfī, vol.I, p.174

[2]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p.186

[3]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p.376. Qāmūs al-ridjāl, vol.IV, p.267

Abū Bakr went on, "In the case of him to be Imām; therefore, for everyone after him it's permissible to be Imām not having any sword in his hand. If not, فانت ماجاء بك ما هيهنا[1] "What caused thee to come here."

Faḍl Ibn Shādhān of Imām's companions and Shi'ites scholars exists in the way of the afore said quotation. This narration has additionally been narrated in two different ways. As quoted in other narrations, Zayd confirmed that just three Imāms exist and the forth is Qā'im [2], the one who pulls sword. This content, in essence, confirmed the idea about Imamate narrated by Zayd. Apparently there shouldn't be any rooms for doubt three Imāms whose obedience is obligatory from God and the forth on condition of being Qā'im were considered by Zayd and this Qā'im can only be of Fāṭima's dynasty.

Zayd, in Furāt Kūfī's interpretation, was asked about an Imām who necessarily should be obeyed, and he said, "The Messenger was the prophetic Messenger and nobody can challenge him ... and after him 'Alī in legal and illegal considered the Muslim's Imām ... and everyone rejecting him is unbeliever ... and after him Ḥasan and Ḥusayn are Muslim's Imāms ... and then we, the Messenger's descendants, are of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn. None of us possessed their dignity to the Messenger and claimed the Prophet's remarks concerning Ḥasanayn for ourselves but our cordiality, friendship and help, as the Prophet's descendants, is every Muslim's duty ... But among us, the offspring of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, no one neither my father nor my brother claimed to be Imām whose obedience is mandatory..., O father of Hāshim! Among us, Imām whose obedience is the one revolting with sword invites to Qur'ān and practice of the prophet ... we, among ourselves, don't know any Imām who necessarily should be obeyed, busy on his own, pinning hopes for his being truthful, his being locked up and waiting for the tyrants' rules to be executed."[3]

The mentioned interpretations whose content existed in the aforesaid narrations are very clear. Quoting Zayd in other narrations of the same book, it's said that the Immaculates among us are five, the Messenger, 'Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn and Fāṭima and the rest like ordinary people do sins. Then Zayd refers to the high status of the household and their role in keeping Qur'ān and tradition.[4] Zayd's interpretation concerning Imamate is available in Kāfī

---

[1]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p.416

[2]. Ibid, p.351

[3]. Tafsīr Furāt, p.182

[4]. Ibid, p.152

Kulaynī's book.[1] Quoting Zayd, Ḥimyarī in al-Ḥūr al-'Ayn mentioned such a remark.[2]

On the contrary to all these narrations, quoting Zayd, Sulaymān Ibn Khālid – Imām Bāqir's only companion who took part in Zayd's uprising – said, جعفر امامنا في الحلال والحرام "Dja'far is our Imām in legal and illegal."[3]

Zayd, in this remark, confesses to Imām Bāqir's scientific Imamate. From this, it isn't inferred that Zayd considered his brother as Imām whose obedience is obligatory. Zayd, in the content of another quotation, confined that Imām 'Alī's books are available to him. Also Zayd in the other narration said, من اراد الجهاد فالي ومن اراد العلم فجعفر بن محمد[4] "Whosoever wants to Djihād, he shall come to me and one who is after knowledge, he shall meet Dja'far Ibn Muḥammad."

This indicates scientific Imamate and doesn't basically accept Imām Ṣādiq's political Imamate. The transfer of these narrations, especially what happened between Zurāra and Zayd or Mu'min al-Ṭāq and Zayd on precautionary dissimulation isn't right and lacks evidence.[5]

However these narrations indicate Zayd's lack of belief in Imām who should be necessarily obeyed, some quotations in Kifāyat al-Athar conformed Zayd's belief in Twelve Imām's Imamate and through a brief study, it was cleared up that the majority of these narrations were baseless and the authorities mentioned in their predication were mostly unknown. Narration of these hadith, four or five, by Wāsiṭī and Fuḍayl al-Rassān who were of Abu l-Djārūd's companions of Zaydids's directors is the interesting point. In this case, how is it possible for two of Zaydids's directors to narrate hadiths in which their Imām i.e. Zayd believed in Twelve Imāms? Abu l-Djārūd is of founders of Zaydids ideology, the one who doesn't basically accept any Imām whose obedience is obligatory after Imām Ḥusayn (a).

With all these, it should be cleared up that Imāms praised Zayd's personality for having good attributes and pure intentions, in these cases, this matter shouldn't be continued anymore. But different aspects of the issue should be considered.

The owner of Riāḍ al-'Ulamā inferring the point that his uprising happened without Imām Bāqir's permission according to the narrations that there existed no banned prohibition of the uprising and Zayd was free to

---

[1]. al-Kāfī, vol.I, p.357

[2]. al-Ḥūr al-'ayn, p.188

[3]. Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, p.361; Qāmūs al-ridjāl, vol.IV, p.267

[4]. Tanqīḥ al-maqāl, vol.I, p.469

[5]. Tanqiḥ al-maqāl, vol.I, p.468

choose either self-sacrifice or worldly life.[1] It is obvious that he not only couldn't completely reject the slanderous narrations but also made it clear that his uprising was done without permission.

The late Madjlisī quoting interfering narrations said, "It's better both to have a favorable opinion about Zayd and for him not to be reproached and not to object Imām's descendants like him unless the rule based on the aversion to people like Dja'far Ibn Kadhdhāb shall be proved.2 It's clear that such an interpretation was said through precaution not reasoning. Although it should be accepted that of old, Shi'ites scholars were optimistic about Zayd, the slanderous narrations about him are all written.3 We formerly observed that Shiykh Ṣadūq made Shi'ite Muslims' opinion clear concerning favorable opinion about Zayd, as Ibn Kharrāz Qumī, of forth A.H. concerning scholars, expressing the same opinion wrote that Zayd rebelled to enjoin the good and forbid the evil not to oppose Dja'far Ibn Muḥammad, his brother's son. Of course the case was raised in a way that duality was basically denied and the emergence of this problem was merely resulted from Imām Ṣādiq's lack of uprising. Not relying on the discrepancy, we can insist on the lack of allegiance. Ya'qūbī, as a Shi'ites historian just had a brief reference to Zayd's uprising. Such a stand was considered due to that of the Shi'ite Muslims in being heedless of Zayd's uprising.[4]

Based on what mentioned in "Irshād" and "I'lām al-Warā", the view points of Shiykh Mufīd and Ṭabarsī is that Zayd was very honorable and called to, الرضا من آل محمد "Satisfaction of Prophet's family."

People erroneously thought that he called people to himself while he was aware of his brother's merit, Imām Bāqir as well as his will for Imām Ṣādiq.[5] According to what was said, accepting such an opinion to this extent is difficult. Having a favorable opinion about Zayd, al-'Amrī, the Shi'ites genealogist of the 5th century, considers the Zaydids as liars in their laying claim to Zayd.[6] This action, at the same time, includes both defense of Zayd and denial of Zaydids. The late Muḥaddith Nūrī confirming Zayd rejected

---

[1]. Riyāḍ al-'ulamā', vol.II, pp.352-353

[2]. Mirāt al-'Uqūl, vol.IV, p.120

[3]. Perhaps it's said that Ṣadūq's opinion indicates that Shi'ites scholars rejected all the slanderous narrations. In this regard, it demands mentioning that what Ṣadūq said, can't be ascribed to all Shi'ite Muslims while most of his opinions are rejected by Shiykh Mufīd in Taṣḥīḥ al-i'tiqād.

[4]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.326; see, Baḥth fī nash'at 'ilm al-tārīkh 'ind al-'arab, p.53

[5]. al-Irshād, p.268; A'lām al-warā, p.257

[6]. al-Mudjdī, pp.156-157; see, Ghāyat al-ikhtiṣār, pp.128-129

the slanderous narrations about him.[1] As it has been stated, among the recent thinkers exist some like Ḥusayn Karīmān and Āyat Allāh Muntaẓirī who tenaciously support Zayd.[2]

This issue was briefly brought to an end; however, other quotations whose significance is lesser than aforesaid ones exist, they demand a detailed and investigative study to get a more realistic viewpoint and its fulfillment is impossible in this brief general history.

YAḤYĀ IBN ZAYD'S UPRISING

Yaḥyā, son of Zayd was among those who participated in his father's uprising. He after father's martyrdom and his burial accompanied by father's Shi'ite Muslims, went to Niynawā and Madā'in. He stayed there with a farmer for some time and then went to Riy and Khurāsān.[3] Thinking Yaḥyā was in Kūfa, Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar on top of pulpit reproached people that Yaḥyā hid himself in the women's bridal chamber.[4] He left Riy for Qūmis and stayed there with Ziyād Ibn Abī-Ziyād Qushayrī for fairly a long time,[5] then he went to Niyshābūr.

It was there where he was asked to stay but he rejected and said, "'Alī's flag will not be raised over this city."[6] Maybe in that time, the situation in Niyshābūr wasn't ready for a Shi'ites uprising.

Yaḥyā left Niyshābūr for Sarakhs. He stayed there with a person named Yazīd Ibn 'Umar Tamīmī for six months.[7] "Khāridjites" went to him in Sarakhs and wanted to swear allegiance to him on the base of the war against the Umayyads. Yaḥyā was pleased with their request but Yazīd Ibn 'Umar prohibited him from doing that and said, كيف تقاتل بقوم يتبرؤن من علي واهل بيته "How did he want to help those expressed disgust for 'Alī and his household."

Afterwards, rejecting their request, Yaḥyā through good remarks kept them at the distance.[8] Staying in Sarakhs for six months, Yaḥyā left there for Balkh and lived there with a person called Ḥarīsh. He probably stayed there

---

[1]. Mustadrak al-wasā'il, vol.III, p.599

[2]. Dirāsāt fī wilāyat al-faqīh, vol.I, p.208 and the rest

[3]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.104; see, Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.326

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.259; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.506

[5]. al-Futūḥ, vol.VIII, p.127

[6]. 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.256

[7]. al-Futūḥ, vol.VIII, p.127; 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.259; Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.104

[8]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.260; Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.104

longer than others up to the end of Hishām time and about the time of his death.[1]

Being in pursuance of Yaḥyā, Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar heard of his going to Khurāsān so he asked Naṣr Ibn Sayyār to find him, with Yaḥyā's entrance to Balkh or fairly a long time after that Khurāsān government found out about his settlement there and based on Ibn A'tham's letter gathered all the people in A'ẓam mosque and investigated their houses one by one. Everyone famous for his affection of the Household was brought and whipped to betray Yaḥyā's place.[2]

These investigations resulted in Ḥarīsh's detention. Although he under torture didn't betray Yaḥyā's place, his son did so.[3] 'Aqīl Ibn Ma'qal, the ruler of Balkh, sent someone to bring Yaḥyā who was considered, according to Ibn A'tham's letter, to be in Yūnus. Ibn Sālim's house. Then he was chained and sent to Naṣr Ibn Sayyār who inspired him.[4] During this time, Khurāsān heard about Hishām's death and Walīd Ibn Yazīd in response to Naṣr's letter in which he asked about Yaḥyā wrote to set him free and let him go wherever he wished.[5]

When Yaḥyā was set free, a group of people of Khurāsān went to the blacksmith who made Yaḥyā get rid of the chains and wanted to buy the chains. Some raised the price to twenty thousands dhms. The blacksmith being afraid of news disclosure said to them to put some money together. Then he cut the chain into piece and gave everyone a piece for making rings or for Tabarruk that is a gift considered as bringing good luck.[6]

Yaḥyā went to Sarakhs, writing a letter to its ruler, Naṣr wanted him to send Yaḥyā to Ṭūs. He also wrote to the ruler of Ṭūs to send Yaḥyā to Abarshahr and leave him to 'Amr Ibn Zurāra and Yaḥyā was brought to Biyhaq.[7] In there, Yaḥyā asserted that he was afraid of going to Iraq for Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar was still in power and will probably kill him.[8] It was there where Yaḥyā and his companions clashed with 'Amr Ibn Zurāra. Although

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.261

[2]. al-Futūḥ, vol.VIII, p.128

[3]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.105; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.356; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.261

[4]. al-Futūḥ, vol.VIII, p.129

[5]. Ibid, vol.VIII, p.131, Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.261; Tārikh Gudhīdih, p.186

[6]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.105

[7]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.537

[8]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.261; Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.106

it's said that the number of Yaḥyā's companions touched one hundred, that of 'Amr reached ten thousands or even more, the winner was Yaḥyā.[1]

الم تر اهـــل نيشابور لمـــا لقو الابطال لم يغنوا قليلا
لقوا مئة وهم عشرون ألفاً فما صبروا ولامنعوا قليلا

"Didn't you see the people of Niyshābūr who confronted the champions when they were a few but when their number and that of Niyshābūr was a hundred and twenty thousands respectively, they lacked resistance and were defeated."[2]

Some more details concerning the time before and about the battle were written in some narrations.[3] Leaving there, Yaḥyā went to Djūzdjān and there, he was joined by a group of regional people as well as inhabitants of Ṭāliqān and Fāriyāb. Number of these people, according to the narrations, differed from one hundred and twenty,[4] one hundred and fifty[5] or five hundred.[6] And there arrived Naṣr Ibn Sayyār's army led by Muslim Ibn Aḥwaz. Yaḥyā after three days of battle was hit on the forehead with an arrow. He martyred[7] and so did all his companions.[8] This probably happened at the beginning of the year 126 A.H. in a place called "Arghūna or Arghūnī".[9]

Although being beheaded and buried, he was exhumed and hung up the vault of one of the Djūzdjān's corridors due to Naṣr Ibn Sayyār's order. Being hung to the Abū Muslim's time, his corpse was brought down, prayed on and buried.[10] Yaḥyā's uprising caused Walīd Ibn Yazīd to write to the ruler of Iraq. He wanted him to bring Zayd's corpse down, set it on fire and expose his ashes to the wind.

Yaḥyā's uprising, at any rate, made Khurāsān more and more ready for a public uprising against the Umayyads. Every child born in that year, according to what Mas'ūdī said was named Yaḥyā or Zayd.[11]

---

1. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.537; Tarikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, pp.230-231
2. al-Futūḥ, vol.VIII, p.133
3. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.262; al-Futūḥ, vol.VIII, p.132
4. Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, pp.230-231
5. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.262
6. 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.260
7. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.262; Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.107
8. Tarīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.231
9. 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.266; Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.212; al-Ḥūr al-'ayn, p.189
10. al-Futūḥ, vol.VIII, p.136; Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.263
11. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.213

As some mentioned, Yaḥyā was the first for whom people clad in black and eulogized.[1]

After the victory, anyone of the Yaḥyā's combatants whose names were mentioned in the registry book was found and killed by Abū Muslim.[2] The emotion flared up by martyrdom of Zayd and his son, Yaḥyā, along with the public emotions to the benefit of the Household were considered the main reasons for 'Abd Allāh's victory who at the price of the Household benefited from these emotions.[3]

'ABD ALLĀH IBN MU'ĀWIYA'S UPRISING

'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya Ibn 'Abd Allāh Ibn Dja'far's movement from 127 to 131 can be considered as a Shi'ites movement due to the presence of some Hāshimites and the 'Alawites. No one but his father named Mu'āwiya at whose insistence, this infant was named Mu'āwiya as well.[4] Searching for poetry and literature, 'Abd Allāh, Mu'āwiya's offspring, before his military and political movement had companionship with people whose concern was poetry and literature as well. In the last years of the Umayyads rule, when there existed a battle between Marwān Ibn Muḥammad who claimed caliphate and Ibrāhīm Ibn Walīd Ibn Yazīd, the Umayyads were strongly wanted especially the disputes created by tribal battles between northern and southern Arabs in Kūfa made 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz some difficulties. In a narration, Ṭabarī mentioned, observing the incapability of Iraq's ruler, Shi'ite Muslims called 'Abd Allāh to swear allegiance whose responsibility was taken by a person called Hilāl Ibn Abi l-Ward. 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar's presence in Ḥīra gave 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya the opportunity to occupy Kūfa and even made of Damascus in there swear allegiance to him. Some from Madā'in and Fam al-Nīl swore allegiance to him.

Having an inventive hostility with the Umayyads and considering their successors of the Hāshimites, people of Kūfa paid allegiance to him at once. Rabi'a tribe having a Shi'ites precedence backed 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya up. In the battle between 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya and 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz, companions of 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya didn't seriously resist and left him alone with the head of Rabi'a tribe, 'Umar Ibn Ghaḍbān.

---

[1]. Ansāb al-Ashrāf, vol.II, p.264

[2]. al-Muḥabbar, p.484; Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.102

[3]. See, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd,, vol.VII, p.143

[4]. al-Aghānī, vol.XII, p.223

After that Rabi'a sought quarter for himself, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya as well as his companions and sent him to Medina from Kūfa.[1] He, in Medina, reinforced and went to Djibāl while accompanied by people of Kūfa and its representative[2] and for fairly a long time, ruled over around Iṣfahān, Qūmis, Ḥulwān, Iṣṭakhr and Riy.[3] The battle against him was postponed due to the Umayyads' difficulties in their combats against Khāridjites and other rebels. Having started his rebel in 127, now he in 128 weakly ruled over Iṣfahān and Iṣṭakhr. His brothers were sent to Fārs, Djibāl as well as Abū Dja'far Manṣūr ruled over Ahwāz (Īdhadj) for some time then facing some difficulties, he could do nothing.[4]

After some time, at least in 129, he combated in Iṣṭakhr 'Āmir Ibn Ḍabbāra who was dispatched to him by the Umayyads in Iraq. Being defeated in the aforesaid battle, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya went to Harāt and there he was arrested by Abū Muslim's agent and sent to him. Abū Muslim of 'Abbāsids' agents felt at risk on his side, so imprisoned him and ordered to treat hard on him. Balādhurī stated that while in prison, 'Abd Allāh called people of Khurāsān fools for their obedience to Abū Muslim.[5] Hearing of this news, Abū Muslim put more pressure on him. The 'Alawites and the Ṭālibites would be suppressed by Abū Muslim, for he was of the 'Abbāsids' agents. According to a fully explained letter, written by 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya, he was put in chains.[6] Balādhūrī through a narration stated that he, being in Abū Muslim's prison, passed away but in another quotation by Hishām Kalbī, it is mentioned that he was murdered by Abū Muslim.[7]

An abstraction of all reports about him from different sources is prepared by Abu l-Faradj in just a few pages. Some contradictions exist among them.

According to one quotation, he called people to, الرضا من آل محمد "Satisfaction of the Household" but in another one he invited them to his own allegiance.

Also in news, it's mentioned that he dressed like "Ṣūfis" and the majority of people of Kūfa swore allegiance to him some others did not so

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.XII, p.223

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, pp.601-604

[3]. See, Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.I, p.63; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.VI, p.38; al-Aghānī, vol.XII, p.229

[4]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.63; Tārīkh Iṣbahān, Abū Nu'aym,, vol.II, p.42; 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.38

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.66

[6]. Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.428; al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn, vol.II, pp.85-86

[7]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.66

and said, "No one is left for us and most of us were killed with the people of this house!"

He also mentioned in details that although 'Abd Allāh sent his brothers named Ḥasan, Yazīd, 'Alī and Ṣāliḥ to Iṣṭakhr, Shīrāz, Kirmān and Qum, he went to Khurāsān due to being unable to resist against the Umayyads.

On his way, he was seen and asked, "Are you of the Messenger(s)'s progeny? Are you Ibrāhīm, the Imām?" But these questions were given a negative answer.

The questioner asked, "So I'm free from your help."

Abu l-Faradj also stated, "Being greedy for Abū Muslim's help, 'Abd Allāh went to him and was imprisoned. There, 'Abd Allāh wrote his famous treatise to him but Abū Muslim being afraid of corruptions of the people's opinion murdered him."[1]

His murder is narrated by others as well.[2] This happened in 131 A.H.[3] Abu l-Faradj in "Maqātil al-Ṭālibīn" mentioned the brief of this news.[4] For 'Abd Allāh was killed by the 'Abbāsids' agent, there existed some forged news against him. An example of it was raised by 'Āmir Ibn Ḍabbāra who accused 'Abd Allāh and his companions of assaulting against women.[5] Here two points are of great significance his personality before the uprising and his stand after that.

The news about him is reported by Abu l-Faradj Iṣfahānī Darāghānī. In the portrait given by him, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya was considered as a poet and a learned person with all the needed possibilities of that time. In addition, he was accompanied by some poets and some accused of dualism – although its purpose isn't clear but can't be mere irreligiousity – and Iṣfahānī named three dualists.[6] In other narrations, he was explicitly accused of dualism.[7] Its correctness isn't exactly specified; however, on the whole it can't be judged. Undeniably in the tumult of Kūfa, he was accepted by people of there as a meritorious person for the battle against the Umayyads. In the case of his accusation of dualism, how such a thing is conceivable? The writer of al-Mudjdī, the fifth A.H. century Shī'a genealogist praised him as, كان سيدا كريما was a generous master and sad that his father made him as his

---

[1]. al-Aghānī, vol.XII, p.230

[2]. Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.427; al-Maqālāt wa l-firaq, p.39; Firaq al-shī'a, p.33

[3]. Ibn 'Inaba mentioned it to be happened in 133. quoting in Harāt, he said that his tomb was people's shrine ... in the year 976; 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.38

[4]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyin, pp.144-116

[5]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.VI, pp.40-41

[6]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyin, p.112; al-Aghānī, vol.XII, p.251

[7]. al-Aghānī, vol.XII, p.233; see: Lisān al-mīzān, vol.III, p.364

successor for[1] لما يعرف فيه من كرم الاخلاق He found in him nobility of characters and his call to the satisfaction of the Household is doubted.[2]

At first, this motto basically indicates this faith that caliphate belongs to Muḥammad's progeny especially who is "Al-Riḍā". Secondly, it, for fairly a long time, was utilized by the 'Abbāsids' summoners to evade and gradually recognize its applicability in the 'Abbāsids. Thirdly, it was regularly used by Zaydids. In fact, popularity belonged to one who called to the satisfaction of the Household not to himself. It isn't cleared up whether such an issue was posed in the time of 'Abd Allāh's uprising or later on. In a narration by Ṭabarī, what is worthy of attention is Zaydids's presence about 'Abd Allāh's uprising.

In one quotation, he stated, وحمل اهل القلب من اهل الشام علي الزيديه Zaydids were attacked by the middle faction of enemy troops from Damascus.[3]

Sometimes else referring to the clash between Zaydiyya and people of Damascus, he said, "Rabi'a sought quarter for himself, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya and Zaydids."[4]

This aspect of the issue has not been indicated in other sources. It demands reminding that to Zaydids, Imām should be from the 'Alawites; however, 'Abd Allāh was a Ṭālibites and naturally these beliefs were constantly formed later on. Perhaps Zaydids for defeating the Umayyads in that time helped him not for their belief in him. And every 'Alawites uprising, to historians, was probably considered as Zaydī in one way or another. In a narration, Ṭabarī indicates that 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya was surrounded by Khāridjites.[5] And this can be considered as a good device to defame others.

'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya has got a portrait in Firaq books. A party called Djināḥiyya and led by 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya was considered of Shi'ites extremists.[6] In the above-mentioned portrait, naturally there is no relation between 'Abd Allāh's issue and that of Zaydids. Sa'd Ibn 'Abd Allāh Ash'arī mentioned a party linked to him of the Kīssānids who believed in Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya's Imamate and considered his son, Abū Hāshim, as his successor. In continuation, they believed that he left will

---

[1] al-Mudjdī, p.297

[2]. Some said that he called to satisfaction of the Household (Nathr al-durr; vol.I, p.427} and the other stated that he invited to Himself, 'Umdat al-ṭālib, p.39

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.603

[4]. Ibid, vol.V, p.604

[5]. Ibid, vol.VI, p.40

[6]. al-Wāfī Bi l-wafayāt, vol.XVII, p.63; Farhang firaq Islāmī, p.142

for 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya.[1] Shahristānī mentioned a party named Ḥārithiyya who believed that 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya as Isḥāq Ibn Zayd incarnated.[2] We learned that Madā'in – where Ibn Isḥāq was from – possessed a lot of Shi'ites extremists. It is likely to say that all these problems, after the murder of 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya, were probably raised by others while he didn't have anything to do with them. The same issue is true about Shi'ites Imāms (a) whose spirits were claimed to incarnate in some people.

Anyway, this point is to be reminded that the Umayyads, the 'Abbāsids and the majority of historians couldn't be pleased by a person like 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya for having rebelled against them as well as being of 'Alawites' swords holders. Therefore, he is at all sides surrounded. Naturally, he doesn't have anything to do with what happened after him and of course, such judgment doesn't mean the confirmation of all his behaviors and companionship with various people.

Most of the Hāshimites attended the 'Abd Allāh's movement and Abū Dja'far Manṣūr is a typical of that. We know that in that time, 'Abbāsids worked independently and why presence of Abū Dja'far alongside 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya is of great importance. Maybe the reason is that victory attainment wasn't seriously taken into account by the 'Abbāsids. In that time, the concern of their efforts was to come to terms with 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya and 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥasan known as Nafs Zakiyya at times to get their share in the future.

THE SHI'ITE MUSLIMS AND THE 'ALAWITES' LAST POSITION IN THE UMAYYADS'S TIME

A great deal of evidence is available showing that to Iraq only 'Alawites were considered as Umayyads's successors and when 'Abbāsids through the force of Abū Muslim Khurāsānī and Abū Salama Khallāl ruled, in that time the imagination of 'Abbāsids' coming to power was raised. The whole situational climate was naturally to the benefit of 'Alawites and their political status was thoroughly clear.

The ambiguous but meaningful interpretation of الرضا من آل محمد Satisfaction to the Household were applicable to 'Alawites. The imagination of those familiar with this term was the same but the disagreements among 'Alawites were problematic. This disagreement was mostly like that of Ḥasanids and Ḥusaynids.

---

[1]. al-Maqālāt wa l-firaq, p.38

[2]. See, Farhang firag Islāmī, pp.147-149

On one side, Ḥusaynids whose outstanding figures were Imām Bāqir and Imām Ṣādiq distinguished among Shi'ite Muslims and other religious scholars due to the scientific and ethical position in Iraq community. Ḥusaynids, having a great deal of Shi'ite Muslims believed in their Imamate and considered them as persons whose obedience is necessary. On the other side, Ḥasanids among whom 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥasan Ibn Ḥasan make effort to introduce his son, Muḥammad, as the only 'Alawites candidate for the Umayyads's rule and succession had their own heritage of 'Alawites. It cannot exactly be cleared up whose influence was more than the other but 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥasan possessing a better status among 'Alawites and Hāshimites could to some extent strengthen his son's position[1]; however, in Iraq a letter based on the acceptance of government was written to Imām Ṣādiq by Abū Salama, the 'Abbāsids' great summoner and regardless of its being serious or not, it indicates Imām's political status. Imām Ṣādiq's Shi'ite Muslims and the kind of their beliefs were discussed in advance and now here is a brief look at efforts made by Nafs Zakiyya his father for attainment of leadership.

Balādhūrī, through a narration, indicated that one day, Ḥasan Muthannā, son of Imām Mudjtabā, who were superior to his brothers went to 'Abd al-Malik who asked him about the reason for a premature aging.

Yaḥyā Ibn Ḥakam being present there said, "Iraqis wished who every year invite him for caliphate has done such a thing to him".[2]

Such a remark indicates that 'Alawites were gladly received by Iraqis; however, it lacked a clear direction. Even 'Abd Allāh Ibn Dja'far's descendants had the same background. Some issues concerning 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mu'āwiya Ibn 'Abd Allāh Ibn Dja'far were set forth in advance. Even before that, when Ḥadjdjadj decided to marry 'Abd Allāh Ibn Dja'far's daughter, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Marwān who was warned due the fact that this marriage along with the situation in Iraq to the benefit of this family may lead to the Umayyads' overthrow interfered in it and Ḥadjdjadj divorced her.[3]

In any case, 'Abd Allāh doing a great deal of measures for his son, Muḥammad known as Nafs Zakiyya and calling him "Mahdī", made him an important status among the Umayyads and others. As indicated in some historical news, some meetings were held in this regard and the Hāshimites were called to swear some the 'Abbāsids among them Manṣūr and Saffāḥ swore allegiance to him.

---

[1]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.76

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.II, p.74

[3]. al-Kāmil fi l-adab, vol.I, p.349; Nathr al-durr, vol.IV, p.56; Balāghāt al-nisā', p.111

Through a narration by Abu l-Faradj, it is obvious that Hāshimites going together in Abwā' made up their minds to select and pay allegiance to someone among themselves. 'Abd Allāh stating that his son, Muḥammad, is Mahdī wanted them to swear allegiance to him. Manṣūr being present there confirmed his allegiance to him. 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥasan stated not to let Dja'far Ibn Muḥammad (s) know since he will spoil everything.

Hearing of this, Imām denied Mahdawism of Muḥammad Ibn 'Abd Allāh and said, "I'm willing to give him a hand if his uprising is to enjoin good and forbid evil", but 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥasan accused him of jealousy.[1]

According to Balādhūrī, after allegiance, Nafs Zakiyya went to Bādiya and stayed there for some time and attended in public at times up to the time of allegiance to Abu l-'Abbās Saffāḥ. When Nafs Zakiyya was in Ghaṭfān region alongside Āl Arṭāt Ibn Shabīha, he was sent to Bādiya and called Mahdī.[2] When the 'Abbāsids came to power, he hid himself until his revolution in 145 in Medina and he was killed. Manṣūr having paid allegiance to him was terribly afraid of him and just after his murder and his brother, Ibrāhīm Ibn 'Abd Allāh found comfort.

What is worthy of attention here is that the Abassids were independently doing some activities and Ibrāhīm, the Imām, sent some representatives to different regions. They took advantage of 'Alī's and his descendants' names to draw people's attention[3] and ruled one after the other.

---

[1]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, pp.40-41; al-Irshād, p.277; Kashf al-ghumma, vol II, pp.172,173

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.III, p.79

[3]. Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, p.233; see, Tārīkh tashayyu' dar Irān, p.139-143

CHAPTER XII
DECLINE OF THE MARWĀNIDS

ḤĀRITH IBN SURAYDJ IN KHURĀSĀN

Khurāsān was the major troubled spot for the Umayyads since it was not only far from the capital but also it had its own problems such as tribal wars between the Arab immigrants, cruelties of the Umayyads prevalent there and relative political and economic independence which had made there an important center among the eastern provinces. The formation of the crucial revolutions out there during the final years of the Umayyads ruling was not something which could be easily overlooked by them. And finally from the very same spot appeared a massive army that overthrew the Umayyads. Now the riot of Ḥārith Ibn Suraydj, one of the important riots, from 166 to 127 (A.H.) is to be discussed.

One of the riots against the Umayyads in Khurāsān was Ḥārith's that paved the ground for the 'Abbāsids to do so and gain victory. Ḥārith was an Arab from Tamīm tribe who opposied the Umayyads rulers from 116 to 128 (A.H).

Khurāsān not only was far from the capital, as a crucial center, but it was suffering from tribal discords as well. In addition the wrong treatment of the Arab caliphate of the Umayyads towards Mawālī (freed slaves) was another problem. The cruelties of the Umayyads rulers, which were increasing day by day except the brief period in which 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz ruled, had resulted in some extended riots.

Zayd's riot which happened after the riot of Yazīd Ibn Muhallab was a more significant one.[1] His main intention was supporting religion and bringing justice to the society. Being at odds with the Umayyads rulers, Ḥārith had repeatedly proposed the idea of counseling for appointing the ruler.[2] The events regarding Ḥārith's riot were described in Ṭabarī and in other sources they were disregarded either completely or partially.

---

[1]. Yazīd Ibn Muhallab's riot, as it was touched on before, was a political one, emanating from his opportunism.

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.VI, pp. 2-3

When Djunayd 'Abd al-Raḥmān died in 116, Ḥārith appreciated this opportunity and gave start to his uprising. Within a short period of time he managed to seize some cities such as Balkh, Djūzdjān, Fāriyāb, Ṭāliqān, Marw al-Rūdh.[1] Since the people of various cities hated the Umayyads rulers, they surrendered to Ibn Suraydj, as later on 'Āṣim Ibn 'Abd Allāh who was Khurāsān governor said, easily at their own will.[2] Accordingly, 'Āṣim wanted to ask for help from Damascus army. This was a threat for most of the Iraqi rulers as well as the rulers of other areas. After some clashes between 'Āṣim Ibn 'Abd Allāh and Ḥārith, Ḥārith was defeated and escaped towards Iraq. Those farmers who helped him upon hearing about his defeat went back to their own lands.[3] Ḥārith once again equipped his army. When 'Āṣim became aware that he had been deposed, he compromised with Ḥārith. He also suggested that they ask Hishām to follow Qur'ān and Prophet's Sunna and if he did not accept them, they would revolt against him. At the end, those supporting 'Āṣim could not compromise after a clash with 'Āṣim, Ḥārith retreated.

Knowing about Ḥārith's riots, Hishām asked Khālid Ibn 'Abd Allāh Qasrī, the governor of Iraq, to send his brother Asad Ibn 'Abd Allāh, the former governor of Khurāsān, to suppress his riot. He along with the armies of Damascus and Iraq headed for Khurāsān. After some clashes between Ḥārith and him and a war between the residents of Tirmidh and again Ḥārith, Ḥārith was defeated and escaped eastwards to take refuge by the Turkish kings who were called Khāqān.[4]

One of the well-known Turkish kings helping him later on came to be known as Abū Muzāḥim for he was a trouble-maker for Arabs.[5] Asad Ibn 'Abd Allāh by no means could disregard the behavior of the Turkish kings in spite of the fact that in his clashes with them most of the time he could defeat them.

There were still clashes with the Turks when Naṣr Ibn Sayyār was chosen as Khurāsān's governor in 121. He had led some of these clashes in Balkh. In those clashes Ḥārith Ibn Suraydj, along with the Turks, fought with Naṣr Ibn Sayyār[6]. After his defeat in Balkh, Ḥārith and his supporters all settled in Takhāristān. Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar, the governor of Iraq, asked then Naṣr Ibn Sayyār to attack the city of Shāsh, that had harbored Ḥārith, and

---

[1]. al-Futūḥ, vol.VIII, p.106; Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 429

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 429

[3]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 430; The word "farmers" here refers to the owner of big farms who had great power locally.

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 438

[5]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 443

[6]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 493

beat it to the ground.[1] Provoking people to help him, Naṣr reached Shāsh after a minor clash. Then he ordered the king of that city who had compromised with him to expel Ḥārith from there. He accordingly sent him to Fāriyāb.

Ḥārith and his supporters stayed there up to the time that Yazīd Ibn Walīd by killing Walīd Ibn Yazīd in 126 came to rule the Umayyads. He wanted to reform the Umayyads affairs. Ḥārith was one of the opponents of the Umayyads whose motto just the same as Yazīd was resorting to Qur'ān and Prophet's Sunna. Naṣr who was fighting with Djuday' Ibn 'Alī Kirmānī thought that Ḥārith was a greater threat to him, so he intended to compromise with him. Accordingly, on behalf of Yazīd Ibn Walīd, he sent him a guarantee of clemency so he could return to Khurāsān. Yazīd by stating that he had revolted for Allāh's sake and since Allāh's orders were overlooked and people were under constant oppression, then he could return to Khurāsān again. He also ordered the governor of Iraq to release his children and return his properties confiscated[2] up to that. time he had been residing in the Turkish lands for 12 years.

In 127, Yazīd Ibn Walīd was killed. After him Ibrāhīm Ibn Walīd also could not stay in power for a long time. Marwān Ibn Muḥammad was the last Umayyads caliph who came to power after him. Knowing that Marwān would not continue the same policy as Yazīd, Ḥārith clashed with Naṣr along with Kirmānī. After a while, he had a clash with Djuday' Ibn 'Alī Kirmānī and Ḥārith and the Mudrids fought against the residents of Yemen who joined the residents of Kirmān. Ḥārith was killed in that clash in 128. Some points regarding Ḥārith's riot should be taken into account.

There have been, at least, two major reasons for Ḥārith's riot, even if he himself was not aware of them, they could attract public attention in addition to some other minor ones which led to his revolt against the Umayyads one of which was obeying both Qur'ān and Prophet's Sunna and the other one was putting an end to the Umayyads's oppression.

A brief look at Ḥārith's utterances and behaviors will show clearly that in his riot from the start two things were important namely obeying Qur'ān and Sunna and paying allegiance to someone who does so.[3] He did so to

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.V, pp. 494-495

[2]. Ibid. vol.V, pp. 591-592

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 428; Van Vloten in "Al-siyādat al-'arabiyya" (p.62) said that he was inclined towards the Prophet's Sunna. He also referred to an article in Madjallat al-asiwiyyat al-Firānsiyya (october, 1835, p.327) in which the same matter had been pointed out But in "Ṭabarī", the main source for Ḥārith's riot, this matter was told by no means. This was told probably because of the condition of Khurāsān at that time. A piece of poem being quoted from Kumayt Ibn Zayd Asadī in Ḥārith's praise in

divulge that the Umayyads rulers were by no means religious. Since the Umayyads for most of the Muslims were widely known irreligious, at that time referring to Qur'ān and Sunna in most of the riots was useful.

Once Ḥārith in 126 went to Naṣr Ibn Sayyār, Naṣr gave him some gifts but he said, " I am neither after the pleasures of this worldly life nor do I intend to marry an Arab rather". انما أسأل كتاب الله والعمل بالسنّه واستعمال أهل الخير والفضل[1] "I want to obey Qur'ān and Sunna and the pious and learned people."

He also said that he had left Khurāsān for thirteen years just for putting an end to cruelties.[2] Many people joined him since he had written the main objectives of his riot and ordered his agents to read them for the public on the way to Marw and in mosques too.[3]

When he joined Kirmānī, some of his supporters who observed how they were killed and their properties were plundered under the leadership of Bishr Ibn Djurmūz, once one of the closest companions of Ḥārith, separated from him saying. نحن الفئة العادلة ولا نقاتل الا من يقاتلنا "We are just people and we do fight with no one expect him who wages war against us."[4]

What has been said shows that Ḥārith's mottos in his riot were adhering to Qur'ān and Prophet's Sunna and putting an end to the Umayyads's cruelties by which he could attract some people to himself.

Other than the Arabs, some of the farmers who were under the pressure of the Umayyads rulers also joined him to get rid of their cruelties.[5] Actually he, as an Arab, accepted to defend non-Arabs who were in difficult condition, against the Umayyads. What he had done was of great significance both to non-Arabs and Mawālī especially when the Sughdiyān were pressurized to leave their homeland and take refuge by Turks in spite of the fact that they had embraced Islam. For a long period, Ḥārith was among Turks. The majority of them, as it seems, were the Muslims who had not accepted the ruling of Arabs and wanted to get rid of the Umayyads who

---

"Ṭabarī" also can be an evidence in this regard. Although in this poem it was not told that Ḥārith was a Shi'ite, but the phrase Rāyāt Sūd (The black Flags) was used and based on some narrations "Malāḥim wa Fitan" regarding a riot in Khurāsān and using black flags there was used. The use of the phrase "Black Flags" indicates that Kumayt wanted to liken the uprising of Ḥārith to a shī'ī uprising. It is mentioned in a report that Ḥārith considered himself as "the man of the black flags." (Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p. 3) However, thereis no evidence that Ḥārith was a Shī'ī.

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 606

[2]. loc.cit.

[3]. Ibid. vol.VI. p.IV.

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.VI, p.X

[5]. Ibid. vol.V, pp. 429-430. He especially had taken into account the farmers of Djūzdjān.

were taking tribute even from the Muslims. On the other hand, some others did not give up their previous beliefs. They also fought against the Arabs. Van Vloten by referring to a Muslim judge among the supporters of Ḥārith in the Turkish land, as it had been stated by Ṭabarī, concluded that there were some Muslims among them.[1] This is a significant point for removing the doubt of some individuals as Naṣr Ibn Sayyār who had accused Ḥārith of fighting along with the unbelievers against the Muslims.[2]

THE MURDJI'ITES AND THE DJAHMITES IN ḤĀRITH'S UPRISING

The second point worthy of stating in Ḥārith's riot is his relationship with Djahm Ibn Ṣafwān and his attitude towards the Murdji'ites. He was accused of being linked to both of them. Djahm who was from Mawālī[3] after studying in Kūfa for a while returned to Balkh. For some time, he joined Muqātil Ibn Sulaymān, an expert commentator. Disagreeing him, he was exiled to Tirmidh. There he joined Ḥārith and took part in his riot.

Djahm's participation in Ḥārith's riot is a significant point not because of his beliefs regarding Allāh's attributes but because of the fact that by his participation both of them were accused of being Murdji'ites. Politically, there are two opposite attitudes regarding the Murdji'ites one of which is that they were accused of being linked to the cruel rulers since in their views, faith was an inner state and different from good deed, accordingly he who commits a sin is still faithful. This was a belief that the caliphs and other Mammonists after the wordly pleasure took advantage of.

Another point which is opposite to what was said is that the Murdji'ites participated in many uprisings such as that of Yazīd Ibn Muhallab's. Abū Ru'ba, one of the leaders of the Murdji'ites had taken part in Yazīd Ibn Muhallab's uprising against the Umayyads at the very beginning of the second century.[4] The participation of some of the Murdji'ites in Zayd's uprising and accusation of Ḥārith of being linked to them both reveal that the Murdji'ites were at odds with the Umayyads. So how can these two opposite points be judged?

Despite the Khāridjites who regarded the cardinal sinners as unbelievers and also the Mu'tazilites who regarded them as the unbelievers, the Murdji'ites were of the opinion that they would be still assumed believers if

---

[1]. al-siyādat al-'arabiyya, p.66

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.VI, p. 6

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.VI, p. 2

[4]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 340

they believe in two principles of Islam namely unity of Allāh and Prophethood when they commit sins. This is a jurisprudic principle which is accepted by all of the Islamic sects. They had no distinct political stance regarding those who were unbelievers in the Khāridjites' view. According to them, they should be left to Allāh and be hopeful for His Mercy. This also was a controversial point among Muslims regarding 'Uthmān in Djamal and Ṣiffīn wars. During Ḥadjdjādj's tenure in Iraq (also in Africa) in which most of the local residents of Iran embraced Islam, the Umayyads's agents could no longer take tributes from them and increase their revenues. As a result, Ḥadjdjādj in consultation with the Umayyads's caliphs declared that only saying diploma is not enough for someone to be a believer. Instead, someone is Muslim who is able to read Qur'ān. In addition, there might have been some other conditions, for example it must be clear whether he had been circumcised or not. Based on what was said, Ḥadjdjādj went on to collect tributes from those who had newly embraced Islam. There once again the same belief of the Murdji'ites was beneficial. The Murdji'ites in contrast with them were of the opinion that saying diploma was enough for being a Muslim and they declared the conditions that Ḥadjdjādj had set was unvalued in this regard. Accordingly, the Murdji'ites started to support the Iranians who had recently embraced Islam and the revolutionists took advantage of them. Penetration of scholastic and jurisprudic theology of Abū Ḥanīfa in the East and the existence of the Murdji'ites beliefs in Khurāsān and even a village which was called Murdjī Ābād in suburb of Balkh, all are the evidence regarding this matter. Being one of the leaders of the Murdji'ites, Abū Ḥanīfa not only participated in Zayd's uprising but during the 'Abbāsids's term helped the 'Alawites who had joined him as well.[1]

Wellhausen by referring to the above-mentioned point regarding the Murdji'ites added, "They attempted to create a common ground among all tribes and that was opposing tyranny and defining the gospel truth".[2] Van Vloten in his research about the Murdji'ites by referring to their role in solving this difficult problem among various tribes of Muslims and also their emphasis on observing the rights of all Muslims both Arabs and non-Arabs, said that he refrained from judging the caliphs. He also had spoken about the Murdji'ites taking part in Zayd's uprising who had helped him.[3] Anyway, Ḥārith was among the Murdji'ites according to Ṭabarī.

---

[1]. To know about the beliefs as well as scholastic theology of the Murdji'ites, refer to a book entitled "The Murdji'ites, Tārīkh wa Andīshih" from the writer of the very same lines.

[2]. Tārīkh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya. pp. 441, 442

[3]. al-siyādat al-'arabiyya, pp. 64, 65

This verse from Naṣr Ibn Sayyār, Khurāsān's governor, is an evidence indicating that he was from the Murdji'ites,

وارجاءكم لزّكم والشرك في قرن فأنتم أهل اشراك ومرجونا[1]

"You are Murdji'ites and atheists that are the same."

Ṭabarī's narrations regarding Ḥārith and his relationship with the Murdji'ites are mostly about the events taking place during this period. It was said that Ḥārith had asked Djahm to read a book in which Ḥārith way of conduct was described.[2] It was also said that once he came back from Takhāristān he had a clash with Naṣr. Two people have been appointed as judge. One of them was Djahm himself and the other one was Muqātil Ibn Ḥayyān. They said finally that Naṣr should not interfere so that they might themselves be able to consult with each other.[3] There also is another narration regarding Djahm's participation in that uprising. Based on that he was captured and killed then by Salm Ibn Aḥwaz.[4]

A positive point in Ḥārith's movement was regarding its mental aspect and this shows that although these movements shaped mostly in Transoxonia, somewhere far from the scientific centers, they were not merely political ones but they had their own mental principles.

At last, it should be said that the term Djahmī, based on the reaction of its opponents, and in a lesser degree, accusation of being Murdji'ites are two curses that the traditionists had in their minds against their opponents. Some of the Djahm's beliefs were against incarnation and the subject narrations on simile, so the traditionists opposed him. Gradually, this term as a scientific curse was used while referring to most of the people with quite different beliefs. Khālid al-'Alī's book which was previously referred to can make this point clearer.

WALĪD IBN YAZĪD'S CALIPHATE AND EXTREME CORRUPTION OF THE UMAYYADS

Without doubt, one of the main reasons of the overthrowing of Umayyads, being considered mostly by the rioters, was that their rulers were irreligious. In other words, since they were indifferent towards both religious beliefs of the people and those of themselves, those religious people were made rise up against them. Walīd Ibn Yazīd was among those rulers. Being the worst of all, he was one of the last caliphs of the Umayyads

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.433

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī,. vol.VI, p.2

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.VI, p.3

[4]. Ibid. vol.VI, p.6; al-Milal wa l-niḥal, vol.I. p.79

who came to power after Hishām in Rabī‘ al-Thānī, 125 and was killed one year and two months later.

There are some poems descriptive stories and almost all historical sources indicating that he was a corrupted man.

Ṭabarī, for example said, "There are many narration's regarding Walīd's insult to religion".

He had not mentioned most of them to avoid circumlocution.[1] Mas‘ūdī, on the other hand, had quoted some of them. He was very interested in drinking wine and passing nights among different singers and debauchees was his every day action.[2] One of the worst actions, as it was told, was after reciting this verse,

وَاسْتَفْتَحُوا وَخَابَ كُلُّ جَبَّارٍ عَنِيد.

"And (Allāh's Prophets) asked for solutions and at last each obstinate tyrant became disappointed."

He said that he disliked it. Then he put Qur'ān somewhere and shot toward it saying,

اتوعد كلّ جبـــار عنيد فها انا ذاك جبـار عنيد

اذا ما جئت ربك يوم حشر فقل يارب حرقني الوليد[3]

Are you threatening Djabbār, the fighter. I am Djabbār the challenger. On the Day of Judgement, say to Allāh to set fire on me

Somewhere else, Walīd himself by denying Prophethood had openly said that he was an infidel.

تلعب بالخلافة هاشمي بلا وحي أتاه ولا كتاب[4]

"A man of the Hāshimites played with succession without being revealed a Book."

Mustuwfī regarding his wrongdoing, had said, "It was said that on one Friday he had drunk wine with one of his bondmaids then he had sexual intercourse with her. Then she had forced the defiled drunken bondmaid to put turban on her head to cover her ringlet once she heard Iqāma, then she preached sermon[5]. Being a remiss, one who could not supervise the affairs

---

[1]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 538

[2]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 213; al-‘Iqd al-farīd, vol.V, p. 197; See, Tārikh Mukhtaṣar al-duwal, p. 118; al-Aghānī, vol.VII, p. 46

[3]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 216; Tārīkh Gudhīdih, p. 286; al-Ḥūr al-‘ayn, p.190; Bahdj al-ṣabāqa, vol.V, p. 339; al-Aghānī, vol.V, p. 49; Nudjūm al-zuhra, vol.I, p. 299

[4]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 216; al-Ḥūr al-‘ayn, p. 190; Bahdj al-ṣabāqa, vol.V, p. 239

[5]. Tārīkh Gudhīdih, p. 286; al-Aghānī, vol.VII, p. 47

of various cities, Walīd, according to Ya'qūbī, did many wrong things. For instance, he had in his mind to build a room upon the roof of Ka'ba for his debauchery so he ordered someone to do so.[1] It seems that his relatives prevented him from doing so for they were afraid of its consequences. Another time, he asked Naṣr Ibn Sayyār to send him musical instruments.[2] His brother, and accomplice in the murder of Yazīd Ibn Walīd, also endorsed that he was after sin and iniquity.[3] It is worth saying that this sentence, يا وليد احذر الموت[4] "O Walīd, be afraid of death" Had been engraved on his ring.

The Umayyads degraded day by day simply because of what Walīd did. وظهر للناس منه تهاون بالدين واستحفاف به[5] "He was the cause of public negligence in religion."

Abu l-Faradj regarding him had said, "There has been written many poems about his wrongdoing."[6] In spite of the fact that nearly all of the Umayyads rulers were sinful and people were aware of this matter more or less, no one among them was comparable to Walīd in this regard. His remissness in state affairs raised discord among the Umayyads and paved the ground for the opportunists among them to exert themselves more to prevent that dynasty from being fallen. Because of his actions, Walīd was disgusted by others and they were ready to kill him.

Abu l-Faradj Iṣfahānī, at the beginning of the seventh volume of Aghānī had described him in detail. All of his life was past while he occupied himself with wine, women and music. He was also accused of being heretic. In Aghānī there are some verses indicating that he had believed that "Mānī" was the first and the last prophet.[7] According to Madā'inī, he was disliked by people because of his aspirations, drinking and annoying the children of Hishām Ibn 'Abd al-Malik.[8] Once his palace was surrounded by troops loyal toYazid Ibn Walīd, he asked people while he was there, "Why do you attack me while I was open-handed among you?"

---

1. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.335; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 521. He wanted to take wine to that room. Bahdj al-ṣabāqa, vol.V, p. 340
2. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 533
3. Ibid. vol.V, p. 555
4. Ma'āthir al-ināfa fī Ma'ālim al-khilāfa, vol.I, p. 156
5. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 521; al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.V, p. 206
6. al-Aghānī, vol.VII, p. 2
7. al-Aghānī, vol.VII, p. 72, see, 74
8. Ibid. p.73

They answered, انتهاك ما حرّم الله وشرب الخمور ونكاح أمهات اولاد أبيك واستخفافك بامرالله "Because you have disregarded what Allāh has regarded as being unlawful, you also married your father's bondwomen who had children from him."

He said, "You are wrong."

Then he added, وان فيما احل الله لسعة عما ذكرت[1] "What Allāh has declared as being lawful are more than what you are speaking about."

When he was killed by a group of rioters, Yazīd Ibn Walīd who was also called Yazīd III came to power.

Ayyūb Sukhtiyānī, who knew Qur'ān by heart said, "I wish our caliph were alive".

The narrator said, "He said this because he was afraid of being killed".[2]

Later on, Rashīd and his son Mahdī 'Abbāsī, recalled Walīd a good man and cursed his murderer, Yazīd.[3]

Yazīd Ibn Walīd's Riot

It was said that Yazīd Ibn Walīd, Yazīd III, was similar to 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz in behavior. He, along with some of the Umayyads and renowned figures of Damascus managed to resist Walīd and finally killed him in Djamādī al-Thānī, 126 (A.H.). He was the first Umayyads caliph who was killed in such a way that all people knew about it.

What distinguished him from other Umayyads caliphs was that he was among the Qadarites.[4] This term, according to the traditionists, is referred to the Mu'tazilites. They were of the opinion that human beings have free will. The Mu'tazilites were at odds with the traditionists since they were rationalists while the traditionists were superficial. Because of their influence on the Umayyads, the traditionists provoked them to suppress the Mu'tazilites, the Murdji'ites and the Djahmites. The formation of the Qadarites in Damascus goes back to the time of Hishām Ibn 'Abd al-Malik. Ghaylān Dimashqī, the founder of this sect in Damascus,[5] was killed in 119 by Hishām 'Abd al-Malik.[6] Ghaylān was linked to the Murdji'ites too.[7] There were others among the Murdji'ites in Damascus too. Ṭabarī had quoted 'Amr Ibn Sharāḥīl, who was himself among them, as saying, "In 126

---

[1]. al-Aghānī. vol.VII,. 80

[2]. Ibid. p. 82

[3]. al-Aghānī, p. 83

[4]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 336; Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 581; Tārīkh Gudhīdih, p. 287

[5]. al-Firaq Bayn al-firaq, p.117; al-Milal wa l-niḥal, vol.I, p. 51

[6]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p.516

[7]. al-firaq Bayn al-firaq, p.205

some individuals interceded them with Walīd but he praised Hishām's actions in killing or exiling the Qadarites.[1] In contrast with Hishām and Walīd, Yazīd Ibn Walīd was more inclined towards the Qadarites. According to Shāfi'ī, he had gathered some of them around himself. The companions of Ghaylān Dimashqī were also among them.[2] Abū Bakr Khāwrazmī in one of his letters had written that he backed the companions of Ghaylān.[3] Mas'ūdī also said that he was a Mu'tazilites and like them believed in the five principles of them.[4] At that time, however, some of the Mu'tazilites believed in those five principles completely. They, according to Mas'ūdī, resided in other areas of Damascus namely "Dāriyya and al-Mizza". He also said that they helped Yazīd once they saw that Walīd was a sinner.[5] Since Yazīd Ibn Walīd was inclined toward the Mu'tazilites, his status in comparison with that of 'Umar Ibn Abd al-'Azīz was very high in their esteem.[6]

It should be noted that the traditionists during the second and third centuries were not rationalists at all. They only took into account the surface meaning of both Qur'ān verses and traditions which were mostly fabricated ones. They believed in anthropomorphism. To oppose them, the Mu'tazilites emphasized the role of intellect. The first trend prevailed among the traditionists such as Zuhrī, Abu l-Zanād, Radjā' Ibn Ḥaywa who were linked to the Umayyads. The other one as a result opposed the Umayyads. Accordingly, they were attentive to the role of intellect in contrast with those who were attentive to the traditions that were written long ago and were mostly forged ones. These groups were also experts in political affairs so they were opposing the Umayyads both because of their religious and political approaches. As it was touched upon before, Ghaylān Dimashqī, who was killed in 119 by Hishām, and Dja'd Ibn Dirham, who was sent to Khālid Ibn 'Abd Allāh Qasrī by Hishām, were also among them. The latter was killed by Khālid in the feast of sacrifice.[7] Since Dja'd Ibn Dirham was one of the scholars of Marwān Ibn Muḥammad, the last caliph of the Umayyads, he was also called Marwān Dja'dī.[8] He was later on killed because he was at odds with the traditionists. He opposed

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 539

[2]. Tārīkh al-khulafā', p. 253; Siyar a'lām al-nubalā', vol.V, p. 376

[3]. See, Tārīkh al-djahmiyya wa l-mu'tazila, p. 70 from Abū Bakr Khārazmī

[4]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 221

[5]. Ibid. vol.III, p. 226. Because the residents of Mizza had paid allegiance to Walīd before his death; al-Aghānī, vol.VII, p. 75

[6]. Siyar a'lām al-nubalā', vol.V, p. 376

[7]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 433

[8]. Ma'āthir al-ināfa, vol.I, p. 163; Nudjūm al-zāhira, vol.I, p. 322

anthropomorphism, which was prevailed among the Muslims by Jews. According to Shahristānī, this was a belief of a Jewish sect called the Readers. In Torah, also there were some words about anthropomorphism.[1] The same statement was also said by Ibn Khaldūn.[2] Dja'd Ibn Dirham could stand individuals such as Wahb Ibn Munabba and others who were Jewish. Wahb said to him, "Allāh Himself said that He has hands and eyes, so we believe what he had said".[3] Ibn Kuthayyir said, "His beliefs were identical to those of Lubayd Ibn al-A'tham.[4] This statement according to some researchers was not true. He was said to have such beliefs since he opposed the Jews.[5]

Djahm Ibn Ṣafwān who was said to have, the same beliefs as Dja'd Ibn Dirham had also taken the same stance as him. He stood up to Muqātil Ibn Sulaymān, who believed in anthropomorphism.[6] These people were killed not merely because of religious reseasons but because they opposed the Umayyads. To bring an example, we can refer to the companions of Ghaylān Dimashqī who cooperated with Yazīd Ibn Walid. As it was said Djahm Ibn Ṣafwān had joined Ḥārith Ibn Suraydj and was killed in his uprising. According to Qāsimī, ***Dj***ahm was killed not because of his religious beliefs, as it was said by some,[7] but because of political reasons.[8] It is quite obvious that the traditionists were dominant during the Umayyads's time. Based on legal decision, the name of those being killed by the Umayyads should not be divulged.

Yazīd Ibn Walīd in his revolt against Walīd Ibn Yazīd wanted to carry out some reforms. In his first sermon he said, "We did not rise up for this worldly life to assert dominance over others rather for Allāh's sake. We ask all to obey both Qur'ān and Prophet's Sunna since the religious edicts have become outmoded, piety has been disregarded and the unlawful turned to be lawful. He also said, "The Sunna has changed and there are obvious innovations".

---

[1]. al-Milal wa l-niḥal, vol.I, p. 93; see also, p. 106

[2]. Maqdamat Ibn Khaldūn, p. 415; see Buḥūth ma'a Ahl al-Sunna wa l-sulafiyya, pp. 76-91

[3]. Siyar a'lām al-nubalā', vol.V, p. 433

[4]. al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.X, p. 19

[5]. See, Siyar a'lām al-nubalā', vol.V, p. 432 (footnote)

[6]. Ibid. vol.VI, p. 27

[7]. Ibid. vol.VI, p. 27

[8]. Tārikh al-djahmiyya wa l-mu'tazila, p.16

Referring to social justice, he said that he wanted to carry out some financial reform to, حتى تستقيم المعيشة بين المسلمين وتكونوا فيه سواء "When Muslims live in parity

enable all to take advantage of equal rights." He also added, "You can pay allegiance to me based on what I told you. If I break my promise, you can do whatever you want to and if you could find someone more effective than I am, I myself will be the first one to pay allegiance to him.[1] When he nominated Manṣūr Ibn Djumhūr as the governor of Iraq, he ordered him not to be as Walīd since he was killed because of his cruelties towards people.[2]

Yazīd's intention, as he himself said, was not just ruling. He had this sentence written and hung from a post, انا ندعوكم الى كتاب الله وسنّه نبيه صلي الله عليه وآله وسلم وأن يصير الأمر شورى "I ask you to obey Qur'ān and Prophet's Sunna. I also want to solve the problem of ruling by counseling [3]

He also asked the residents of Ḥimṣ who wanted to rise up against him in revenge for Walīd's death. ولكنّه يدعوهم الى شورى[4] I want you to take advantage of counseling.

It should also be mentioned that even before Walīd's death, the residents of Damascus had paid allegiance to him.[5]

Yazīd III was called "Imperfect" since he had cut the share of those who had greater share in public treasury during Walīd's time.[6] For the reason, he ruled just for six months. It seems that he could not put his plan into practice. However, he was somehow successful based on what he was saying and doing in this regard. From among his financial reforms, the issue of taking tribute from those who had recently embraced Islam during 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz's time can be taken into account. He also had taken into account problems of those who were to send to exile merely because they were asked to pay tribute beyond their means. In this regard, he said, ولا أحمل على جزيتكم ما اجليهم به عن بلادهم واقطع به نسلهم "I will not ask people to pay tribute beyond their means so that I prevent them from leaving their home and become extinct."[7]

He also ordered Ḥārith Ibn Suraydj to return from the Turkish land to his home. He had risen up against the Umayyads for the same reasons that

---

[1]. al-akhbār, vol.II, p. 249; al-bayān wa l-tabyīn, vol.II, p. 70

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 576

[3]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 553

[4]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 565

[5]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 545

[6]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 335

[7]. 'Uyūn al-akhbār, vol.II, p. 249

Yazīd had so he accepted to return home. However, when Yazīd was killed, everything returned to its former state. He was killed too.[1] After six months of his ruling, Yazīd died in 126. According to Ṭabarī, before his death, the Qadarites were repeatedly asking him to select a successor for himself. He asked others to pay allegiance to his brother, Ibrāhīm, and 'Abd al-'Azīz Ibn Ḥadjdjādj Ibn 'Abd al-Malik.[2]

THE IMPACTS OF WALĪD'S DEATH ON THE UMAYYADS AND THEIR FALL

From 41(A.H.) up to the time when Yazīd Ibn Walīd came to power, the Umayyads have been weakened twice. The first time was in 64 after the death of Mu'āwiya II when it was intended to transfer power from the Sufyānids branch of the Umayyads to Marwānids having some clashes in Iraq and Damascus, the Umayyads managed to stay in power. Thereafter, the caliphs came to power one by one without any problem. It means that the caliphs who ruled never dismissed their heir apparents who were most of the time their brothers. Even if the caliphs sometimes bothered them. It was believed that they would never dismiss them since they had paid allegiance to them. When, for example, Yazīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik who had chosen his brother Hishām as his successor, became regretful from doing so, then other people such as Khālid Ibn 'Abd Allāh disapproved of what he wanted to do. He said to Yazīd, "What you want to do will sow the seed of discord between you. So people will criticize you." Yazīd accepted what he said[3].

Some of the caliphs such as 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz, however, did not choose either their brothers or their sons as their successors. One of the main reasons for the Umayyads to stay in power was that they respected those principles regarding paying allegiance. As long as they themselves were loyal to those principles, there was no problem and people obeyidg them too. That was why the Umayyads could suppress even the most serious riots. When Walīd Ibn Yazīd was killed and Yazīd III came to power, most of the Umayyads wanted to take his position without considering the issue of allegiance. Upon hearing that Yazīd Ibn Walīd wanted to breach allegiance before Walīd's death, Marwān Ibn Muḥammad wrote a letter to Sa'īd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik, who was probably a renowned figure of the Umayyads dynasty, saying, "Do not let them breach allegiance". He also added, "I have heard that some stupid men among the Umayyads want to breach allegiance.

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 592, 591

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 593

[3]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 314

By their actions, there will be opened a gate which would not be closed even by Allāh unless much blood be shed.[1]

Marwān knew if he breached allegiance, he would sow the seed of discord. Previously, Yazīd Ibn Walīd had consulted with 'Abbās Ibn Walīd who, according to Iṣfahānī, was honest just the same as 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz. He then prevented him from doing so too.[2] After securing allegiance, he said, هلك والله بنو مروان[3] "By God, the Marwānids came to be murdered."

Once Yazīd came to power, according to Ya'qūbī, the country was in a state of turbulence. 'Abbās Ibn Walīd in Ḥimṣ, Bishr Ibn Walīd in Qinnasrīn, 'Umar Ibn Walīd in Jordan and Yazīd Ibn Sulaymān in Palestine revolted against him. Ya'qūbī went on to say, "During a five-month-caliphate of him nearly all countries of the world were in a state of turbulence. The Egyptians killed their ruler, Ḥafṣ Ibn Walīd. The residents of Humas killed 'Abd Allāh Ibn Shadjara and the people of Medina removed their governor, 'Abd al-'Azīz Ibn 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz, from office.[4]

That was why the issue of succession, allegiance and absolute obedience all lost their significance among Arabs. They revolted against one another, as a result, respecting caliphate, something which was very important before was no longer important. This matter was so significant for them that Walīd Ibn Yazīd in his letter, had reminded people to select the successors of his sons Ḥakam 'Uthmān.[5]

In Armenia, Marwān Ibn Muḥammad rose up against Yazīd III to avenge for Walīd's murder. He headed for Iraq to remove Yazīd from office, but on his way to Ḥarrān he compromised with him on condition that he surrender Armenia, Mūṣil, Djazīra and Ādharbāydjān to him.[6]

Ibrāhīm Ibn Walīd came to power after Yazīd. The Umayyads caliphate was so weakened that he was called "Amīr"(commander) not caliph.[7] This term was used for the independent governors who were ruling only during the time of transfering power. They wee neither caliphs nor were chosen by a caliph.

Marwān Ibn Muḥammad who understood that it was the right moment to improve the situation, headed for Damascus. He could defeat their army in

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 455; see also p.581

[2]. al-Aghānī, vol.VII, p. 73

[3]. Ibid. vol.VII, p. 79

[4]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 35

[5]. Ṭārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 529-532

[6]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 595

[7]. Ibid. vol.V, p.596; Siyar a'lām al-nubalā', p. 377; Ma'āthir al-ināfa, vol.I, p. 161

Ṣafar, 127. He asked others to pay allegiance to Ḥakam and ‘Uthmān, Walīd’s successors. Knowing that both of them were killed in prison, then people paid allegiance to Marwān Ibn Muḥammad. To justify their action then, people said that both Ḥakam and ‘Uthmān had selected him as their successor and this was alluded in their poems that was composed in prison. So the last caliph of the Umayyads came to power.

MARWĀN IBN MUḤAMMAD AND THE DECLINE OF THE UMAYYADS

Marwān Ibn Muḥammad was the last caliph of the Umayyads. He left Armenia and went to Damascus to prevent the Umayyads from overthrowing. He came to power by deposing Ibrāhīm. He had many problems one of which was a riot in Ḥimṣ. Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Qays, one of the leaders of the Khāridjites, was a troublemaker for him. Sulaymān Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Hishām in Iraq and Thābit Ibn Na‘īm Djudhāmī in Jordan revolted aginst him. Marwān could suppress those riots then he nominated ‘Amr Ibn Hubayra Fazārī as Iraq’s governor. He killed Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Qays so he had everything under his control. The Khāridjites who were from Yemen were so powerful that they could participate in Ḥadjdj pilgrimage openly. Abū Ḥamza Mukhtār Ibn ‘Awf was one of them who managed to have Medina in his control in Ṣafar, 130 (A.H.) He was among the Abāḍiyya. ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Yaḥyā Kindī who had called himself Ṭālib al-Ḥaqq (the seeker of the truth). He said that he was the Commander of the Faithful. He was among the Abāḍiyya. In Medina Abū Ḥamza preached a sermon in a literary style that is very famous. The residents of Medina, as Ya‘qūbī said, said their prayer under the leadership of him. They were so proud of themselves that they decided to attack Damascus. But the Umayyads army defeated them. When they returned to Medina their residents rose up against them. So they escaped to Yemen.

The city of Khurāsān was in a state of chaos too. Kirmānī advanced but, according to Ya‘qūbī, Abū Muslim was more successful than him.

He quoted Abū Muslim as saying, “O, Allāh, I help both Naṣr and I Kirmānī, not to defeat each other”.[1] Abū Muslim defeated Naṣr and died when he wanted to escape to Sāwi. Abū Muslim then entered Nyshābūr in Ramaḍān, 130. He selected some governors for various districts of Khurāsān. The army of Khurāsān under the leadership of Quḥṭaba and his son turned toward west and could defeat those armies that were behind the Umayyads. In Muḥarram, 132, this army defeated Ibn Hubayra in Iraq. The he escaped to West. Quḥṭaba once again defeated him and he was drowned

---

[1]. Tārikh al-ya‘qūbī, vol.II, p. 341

in the Euphrates. So the Umayyads were doomed to decline. When Marwān Ibn Muḥammad heard the army of Khurāsān had defeated the army of Iraq without having commander, he said, "I swear by Allāh that everything is over. Who has ever heard that a dead body be able to defeat someone who is alive?"

Abū Salama Khallāl in Iraq, asked people to pay allegiance to the 'Abbāsids, once the Umayyads were dethroned, he sent Abu l-'Abbās to Kūfa and after a while, asked people to pay allegiance to him. Later on, he was told to bring the 'Alawites to power so he was killed at Abū Muslim's behest. Saffāḥ sent his uncle, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Alī to Damascus to fight against the Umayyads and kill Marwān. In Dhī al-Ḥadjdja, 132 Marwān was killed in a battlefront. It caused the downfall the Umayyads all over the east except Andalusia. According to Mas'ūdī, they ruled for nearly ninety years and eleven months and thirteen days that is nearly about a thousand months.[1]

Different aspects of the Umayyads's decline were taken into account previously.[2] To elaborate them in detail philosophical discussions about history are needed. Historians do not discuss about them. In philosophical and ideological discussion, individuals can not overlook their personal attitudes so they might manipulate the historical accounts. It should be mentioned that prior to the overthrowing of the Umayyads, no one had spoken about their decline since it was not obvious whether they could solve their problems or not. But after it, the issue of their decline came to be discussed.

Some points regarding the Umayyads should be taken into account one of which is their party demorality over which the Umayyads laid the foundation of their political power. This was closely related to the superiority of a specific tribe of Quraysh, which was called the Umayyads. They were supported by the residents of Damascus in the northern part of the Ḥidjāz. The skirmish between the tribes of northern and southern was almost always troublesome. During the very last years of their ruling, their hostility peaked such that it was not possible for them to improve the condition of some cities especially Khurāsān. There were also some other clashes throughout Arabic land mainly in Iraq and Iran, the residing places of most of the immigrant Arabs. In Iraq, the northern tribe and southern one were at odds with each other. During Khālid Ibn 'Abd Allāh Qasrī's time, Arabs residing in the north that were called the Muḍrites were not satisfied with him since he was living in the south. When Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar came to power, the opposite thing happened. He killed Khālid and the condition was

---

[1]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 234

[2]. Muḥammad Kāẓim Khādjawiyān has listed different attitudes of this kind in an article of the magazine of Mashhad's Faculty of Literature year, 19. pp. 503-530.

worse. Yūsuf Ibn 'Umar then was sent to prison and killed by Yazīd Ibn Khālid Ibn 'Abd Allāh.[1] Tribal clashes, according to Mas'ūdī, were the main reason of the Umayyads's overthrowing, he also said that Marwān Ibn Muḥammad protected the Nazārites against the residents of Yemen. His action then made the residents of Yemen support his opponents from the Hāshimites.[2]

There were more problems in Khurāsān. This city was an escape route years before the Umayyads's overthrowing for Iraqi rebels. Ḥārith Ibn Suraydj doubled the problem of that city. Constant clashes between Arabs and the residents of Transoxania had weakened Arabs there. This city also tackled a problem for decades that was Ḥadjdjādj's cruelties to the newly embraced Muslims and taking tribute from them. In that condition, the skirmish between the northern and southern Arabs threatened the Umayyads. Naṣr Ibn Sayyār backed the Nazārites and Djuday' Ibn 'Alī Kirmānī supported northern Arabs and the residents of Yemen. Their skirmish was advantageous to the opponents of the Umayyads. Abū Muslim Khurāsānī could take advantage of the positive attitude of the residents of Khurāsān towards Shi'ism while he had asked the 'Abbāsids for their support. He was also a good commander. The above-mentioned points altogether had paved the ground for a radical change in Khurāsān. Khurāsān was far from the capital so the Umayyads could not easily reach there. It also should be mentioned that the army of Damascus could not help Naṣr Ibn Sayyār since it was, fighting against the Khāridjites in Iraq. The Khāridjites took advantage of the clashes happening from 126 to 127. Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Qays was among them who was at odds with Marwān Ibn Muḥammad for a long time. He was killed in 127. The Khāridjites who were in Iraq and south of Iran were great threat to the Umayyads too. The victory of the 'Abbāsids in Khurāsān was the main reason of the Umayyads's decline. It was not obvious why the 'Abbāsids not others could take the place of the Umayyads. This has its own reasons related to their approaches not to the decline of the Umayyads, since the Hāshimites were far better than the Umayyads in ruling, they could easily depose them. If they have not had this power, no one could ever imagine that they would be able to remove Quraysh from the scene. This tribe was so powerful that could survive even after the overthrowing of the 'Abbāsids by Mongols.

The Umayyads's fall was somehow because of their internal clashes too. The internal clashes, as it said earlier, had paved the ground for both the caliphs and their heirs apparent who were almost more than two persons from the time of 'Abd al-Malik onward and they were plotting against each

---

[1]. Tārikh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p. 338

[2]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 232

other. The riot of Yazīd III also a threat to their influence. Killing those who were supposed to come to power from 126 to 127 reminds us of the Sassanids's kings during the very last years of their rules.

The Umayyads was not held in high esteem by people because of their lack of attention to religion in spite of the efforts being made by 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz and Hishām. Walīd Ibn Yazīd, on the other hand, made the condition worse with his corruption and cruelties in ruling. In historical sources, there is more information in this regard. Some of these historical accounts, however, have been manipulated, for the writers of them were either inclined toward the 'Abbāsids or other sects.

Another reason for the residents of Iraq and Khurāsān to revolt against the Umayyads was that they were under their domination both politically and economically. The Umayyads were accused of being prejudiced toward the Mawālīs. Non-Arabs, as it was said, had some influence on the Umayyads but it was not such that to let them progress.

POLITICAL VIEWS OF THE MARWĀNIDS

It is certain that some issues such as people's right to decide on a way a caliph should be chosen, to reject or accept him as well as some other matters were the bases of political system of the Sunnis. In addition, the political stance of both Ṣaḥāba (The Companions of the Prophet) and Tābi'īn (The followers of Ṣaḥāba) during the first century should be taken into account in this regard. However, other events taking place thereafter during other centuries were also important in the formation of their policy. But those principles which were written by Māwardī (450 AD) and Abū Ya'lā (458 AD) under the title of al-Aḥkām al-Sultaniyya during the fifth century were mostly emanating from the political developments of the 1st century. To emphasize some of the ordinances, some of political developments of the second century were also mentioned there. For instance, whatsoever both Ṣaḥāba and Tābi'īn did or what the others were doing in their presence without their objection were regarded as a "Divine Decree" which should be obeyed by others too.

Māwardī said, "If what Sulaymān had done is not proof endorsing both the scholars from Tābi'īn contemporary with him and those who do not fear for Allāh's sake will be proof".[1]

This attitude had emanated from the above-mentioned principle of the Sunnis regarding "Divine Decree."

---

[1]. Māwardī, al-aḥkām al-sulṭāniyya, p.13 (Sulaymān Ibn 'Abd al-malik is regarded here).

The formation of the political system of the Sunnis and some other sects was discussed in detail formerly. Now what had happened in this regard during the period of the Marwānīds is to be discussed.

There has been a significant change in the concept of caliphate particularly during the Marwānids. The more the caliphs were separated from the religion, the more the concept of caliphate was held in high regard with the intention of deceiving people. At first, the meaning of caliphate in its political sense was equal to the succession of the Holy prophet. Abū Bakr was not pleased to call such a person "Allāh's Viceroy".[1] But later on, gradually this term came to be used both in poems and sermons. Accordingly, caliphs were honored more and some sort of fatalism prevailed regarding caliphate. The ground has been paved much more during the Marwānids than in time of 'U*th*mān and Mu'āwiya. The poets of that time used some terms in reference to the Marwānīds's caliphs such as, خليفة الله من الارض، الامين المأمون، امام المسلمين، امين الله، امام الاسلام، جنه الدين، الخليفه المبارك، راعي الله في الارض، الامام المصطفي، ولي الحق، الامام العادل، ولي عهدالله ،امام الهدي، الامام المبارك ، امام العدل، الامام المنصور، خيارالله للناس، الحكم المصفي، امام الوري، ربّ الجنود، خليفه الحق، الخليفه الافضل، الملك المبارك[2]

Allāh's Viceroy, trustee and trusted, Muslims' leader, religion's shield, auspicious caliph, public leader on behalf of God, selected Imām, guardian of the Truth, just Imām, Allāh's heir apparent, Imām of guidance, auspicious Imām, leader led by God, selected ruler,supreme chief of council, forerunner of troops, truthful caliph, superior caliph and auspicious ruler, ...

The poets played a significant role in making these terms known to the public. Taking into account the fact that their poets were important to Arabs, one can understand the impact of using such terms by them.[3] One of the Umayyads peoms, Akhṭal by referring to 'Abd al-Malik said,

وقـد جعـل الله الخلافـة فيكـم بابيـض لا عاري الخوان ولا جدب

ولكـن رآه الله مـوضع حقـها علـى رغم اعداء وصدّادة كـذب[4]

---

[1]. Musnad Aḥmad, vol.I, pp. 10-11

[2]. al-umawīyyūn wa l-khilāfa, pp. 19-21

[3]. Farazdaq was among those poets. Despite his well-known poem in praising Imām Sadjdjād, he had composed many verses in praising both the Umayyads's rulers and their relatives. By taking a glance at his poems, one can understand his great rule in the Umayyads stabilization. There are many verses in sanctifying the Umayyads caliphs in his Dīwān. See, Dīwān Farazdaq, vol.I, pp. 261-268. There are some verses in praising Sulaymān Ibn 'Abd al-malik. Some of his poems regarding the stabilization of the Umayyads were mentioned before.

[4]. Dīwān Akhṭal pp.21-24; al-umawīyyūn wa l-khilāfa, p. 30

Thou art Allāh's successor, someone who is merciful and has a shining face. Despite what your enemies desired Allāh saw thee as the mere truth

By referring to Bishr Ibn Marwān, he said,

اعطاكم الله ما انتم أحق به اذا الملوك على امثاله اقترعوا[1]

Allāh has bestowed thee something that Thou deserve while all other kings have something (which they do not deserve)

By referring to 'Abd al-Malik, Djarīr said,

الله طوّقك الخلافة والهدي والله ليس لما قضي تبديـــل

ولّي الخلافة والكرامة أهلها فالملك أفيح والعطاء جزيل[2]

Thou have been appointed as Allāh's vicegerent. What He had decided upon could not be changed. Allāh has given caliphate and greatness to someone who deserves it. That is why thy kingdom is so vast and Thou art so generous

Somewhere else to stress the caliphate of 'Abd al-Raḥmān as a "Divine Decree" he said,

انت الامين امين الله لاسرف فيمـــا وليـــت ولا هيّابـــه ورع

انت المبارك يهدي الله شيعته اذا تفرقـــت الاهـــواء والشيّـــع

يا آل مروان ان الله فضلكم فضلاً عظيماً على من دينه البدع[3]

Thou art Allāh's trustee, someone who does not waste what has been given, someone who is fearless. Thou art the source of blessings. Whenever different parties go astray, Allāh will guide His followers. O the Marwānids! Allāh has regarded Thee.

He also composed,

والله قدّر ان تكون خليفة خير البرّية وارتضاك المرتضى[4]

, Allāh had chosen thee as His viceroy. Thou are the right man for this

Farazdaq said about 'Abd al-Malik,

فالارض لله ولاها خليفته وصاحب الله فيها غير مغلـــوب[5]

---

[1]. Dīwān Akhṭal p.37; al-umawīyyūn wa l-khilāfa, p. 30

[2]. Dīwān Djarīr, vol.I, p.95; al-umawīyyūn wa l-khilāfa

[3]. Dīwān Djarīr, vol.I, p.295

[4]. Ibid. vol.II, p. 620

[5]. Dīwān Farazdaq, vol.I, p.24

The owner of this land is Allāh and thou art as His vicegerent. The owner of Allāh's land would not be defeated there

By referring to Walīd Farazdaq said,

امّا وليد فانّ الله اورثه بعلمه فيه ملكاً ثابت الدّعم[1]

As for Walīd, with the knowledge of God, he was granted a firm monarchy

By referring to Sulaymān Ibn 'Abd al-Malik, he said,

به أمّن الله البلاد، فساكن بكلّ طريد ليلها ونهارها

Allāh selected thee as a peacemaker so a traveller can go whenever he wants to no matter whether it is day or night

'Adī Ibn Riqā' regarding Walīd said,

انّ الوليد اميرالمومنين له ملك عليه اعان الله فارتفعا[2]

Walīd, the Commander of the Faithful, is a king. Allāh assists him in his ruling, so he has been dignified by Allāh

Aḥwaṣ composed this verse about Walīd,

تخيره ربّ العباد لخلقه وليّاً وكان الله بالنّاس اعلما[3]

The Lord of the world had nominated him as His guardian. Taking into account that Allāh is wiser than people

He said about Sulaymān Ibn 'Abd al-Malik,

سليمان اذ ولاك ربّك حكمنا وسلطاناً فاحكم اذا قلت واعدل[4]

O Sulaymān! Since thou have been chosen by Allāh as our king, tell the truth and be just whenever thou want to judge

Farazdaq composed this verse about Sulaymān,

فقال الله انّك انت اعلي من المتلمسين لك الخبالا

فأعطاك الخلافه غيرغصب ولم تركب لتغصبها قبالا[5]

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.II, p. 210

[2]. al-Aghānī, vol.I, p. 299

[3]. Shi'r al-aḥwaṣ, p. 193

[4]. Ibid. p. 173

[5]. Dīwān Farazdaq, vol.II, p.100

Then Allāh said, "Thou art far better than those who want to enervate thee-so thou deserve to be appointed as His viceroy. Thou did not roll thy sleeves to usurp it"

Djarīr composed these verses about Yazīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik

اما يزيـــد فـــانّ الله فهّمه حكماً واعطاه ملكاً واضح النور

يكفي الخليفه انّ الله فضّله عزم وثيق وعند غير تقريـــر[1]

Allāh has given Yazīd wisdom. Thou art as the source of light. Allāh has given thee priority over others in will and it suffices thee

Djarīr Ibn Ayyūb, Sulaymān 'Abd al-Malik's son said,

الله اعطاكم من علمه بكم حكماً وما بعد حكم الله تعقيب[2]

Since Allāh knew thee, He had appointed thee as the ruler, no one is permitted to disobey Allāh's decree

He also said to 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz,

انّ الذي بعث النّبي محمدا جعل الخلافه في الامام العادل[3]

The one who selected Muḥammad as His prophet will, Farazdaq said to Yazīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik,

اعطي بن عاتكة الذي ما فوقه غيرالنبوه والجلال الاجلل

سلطانه وعصا النبي وخاتمـــا القي اله بجرانه والكلكل[4]

Allāh bestowed something to son of 'Ātika. Nothing is greater than it except the Prophethood and monotheism. Allāh had given him both the stick and the ring.

These verses quoted by 'Aṭwān were composed by Farazdaq and Djarīr and others. There are many verses in this regard in Dīwān[5] Farazdaq.

---

[1]. Dīwān Djarīr, vol.I, p.145; Regarding the poets of these verses, see al-umawīyyūn wa l-khilāfa, p. 31-35

[2]. Dīwān Djarīr, vol.I, p.349

[3]. Dīwān Djarīr, vol.II, p. 737

[4]. Dīwān Farazdaq, vol.II, p.125; al-umawīyyūn wa l-khilāfa, p. 36. The second line is about camels. They put their bellies and necks on the ground as a sign of obedience.

[5]. Quoted from Dawlat wa ḥukūmat dar Islām "Government and Ruling in Islam" written by Lambton, p. 110, vol.III. Montigomeri Watt also had quoted some verses regarding the meaning of the time, Allāh's Viceroy during the Umayyads's time. See Watt, God's caliph, Qur'ānic Interpretations and Umayyads claims in Iran and Islam,

The residents of Damascus also honored caliphate from the time of Mu'āwiya onward.[1] During Ayyām al-Muwādi'a the years that the resid ents of Damascus were going to Mecca for pilgrimage while they were under the domination of Ibn Zubayr, 'Ubayd Ibn 'Umayr, the story-teller, backbited their caliph. They said to him,"O the pious man! Retract what you said and do not backbite Allāh's Viceroy since he should be honored even more than Ka'ba.[2]

Ḥadjdjādj himself followed the same policy in Iraq. He told Ḥasan Muthannā, "O Ḥasan! You have to remind him as a good man. He is Allāh's vicegerent on earth.[3] In his first speech in Kūfa he said, ان امیرالمؤمنین عبدالملك بن مروان استخلفه الله عزوجل في بلاده وارتضاه اماما علي عباده[4] "Almighty God placed Amīr al-Mu'minīn, 'Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwān, His Viceroy as well as His servants' leader."

Ḥadjdjādj in his letter to 'Abd al-Malik by referring to him said, "You are the Commander of the Faithful and Allāh's Viceroy. You are infallible both in speech and in practice. You have been nominated as his guardian.[5] Fāṭima, the daughter of 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz said, after coming to power my father has not washed his body when sever he was defiled.[6] The residents of Damascus were of the opinion that obeying him was equal to obeying Allāh. They did not believe that he should obey Allāh.

Then they got angry and said,"You are disobeying the Commander of the Faithful. He could get rid of him very hard.[7] Ḥadjdjādj wanted to treat the residents of Iraq in the same way.

He was told to say, "Do you believe that Allāh does not reveal to me. O people of Iraq! I do swear by him that he still does so".[8]

He was also told to say, "Which one is superior a Messenger or a vicegerent?" Probably he wanted to say that he as Allāh's viceroy was

---

Edinburgh, 1971, pp.571-572, see also. Watt. Islamic Political Thought, Edinburgh, pp. 33, 137, No.5, see also, Khalīfa wa Sulṭān, pp. 16-17.

[1]. Prior to this Ḥassān Ibn Thābit had used the term "Allāh's viceroy" in his poem written in 36 about 'Uthmān. Dīwān Ḥassān Ibn Thābit, p.96, quoted from Government and Ruling in Islam, p.110. the third part of the footnote No.7.

[2]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, vol.IV, p. 345

[3]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.VI, p. 222

[4]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.II, p. 40

[5]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.V, p. 25; al-Shuwrā fi l-'Aṣr al-umawī, p. 35

[6]. Tārīkh al-khulafā', p. 235

[7]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.VI, p. 76

[8]. Ibid. vol.VI, p. 214

superior to Allāh's Prophet.[1] It should be mentioned that it is not certain whether these narrations are true or not. Mas'ūdī attributed the very same statement to Khālid Ibn 'Abd Allāh Qasrī, the governor of Mecca in 89 AH. According to him, he compared Walīd with Ibrāhīm (a). He said, "When Ibrāhīm asked Allāh for water, he sent him salty water while upon Walīd's request, he sent fresh water to him.[2] 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz was of the opinion that not only Sulaymān was nominated by Allāh but he himself was as Allāh's Viceroy too.[3] 'Amr Ibn Hubayra Fazārī, Yazīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik's agent in Iran and Khurāsān, regarding Yazīd told Ḥasan Baṣrī and others,"Yazīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik is Allāh's Viceroy among people."[4] Accordingly, they tried to say that Allāh had helped them to defeat all of their enemies such as the Zaydids and the Shi'ite Muslims, the Khāridjites as well as individuals such as 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Ash'ath and Yazīd Ibn Muhallab. For these reasons, he wanted to prove that the Umayyads were not only legitimate but also invincible.[5]

The holiness of the Umayyads strengthened by attributing Mahdawism to their caliphs. This term was first likely to be used by Allāh's prophet in his speeches. It was also said that Mukhtār Ibn Abī 'Ubayd had used this word in his letter to Muḥammad Ibn Ḥanafiyya. He had written, للمهدي محمد بن علي من المختار بن ابي عبيد؛ سلام عليك يا ايها المهدي[6] "From Mukhtār Ibn Abī 'Ubayd to Muḥammad Ibn 'Alī Ibn Mukhtār. Peace be upon you. O Mahdī!"

Probably, they wanted to emphasize on their role in leading by using this word, but overemphasizing it would decrease its probability. Mudjāhid was quoted as saying, (probably these narration's were attributed to them), "You

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.VI, p. 214; See al-Nizā' wa l-takhāṣum, p. 69; al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya vol.IX, p. 136; al-Naṣā'iḥ al-kāfiya li man Yatawallā Mu'āwiya, p. 31; Wafayāt al-a'yān, vol.I2, p. 228

[2]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 147

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.VI, p. 567; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.V, p. 60; al-Shuwrā fi l-'Aṣr al-umawī, p. 35

[4]. Murūdj l-Dhahab, vol.III, p. 212; al-Shuwrā fi l-'aṣr al-umawī, p. 35

[5]. Farazdaq in praising Hishām Ibn 'Abd al-malik said (Dīwān, vol.I, pp.89- 88)

ابي الله الا نصركم بجنوده ... وليس بمغلوب من الله صاحبه

فما قام بعد الدار قواد فتنه ... ليشعلها الا ومروان ضاربه

ابى الله الا ان ملككم الذى ... به نبت الدين الشديد نصابه

Somewhere else he composed (Dīwān, vol.I, p.215)

غلبتم الناس بالحق اذا ضربوا عليهم وبضرب غير تعذير

[6]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.VI, p.62

would call Mu'āwiya Mahdī if you could see him.[1] Farazdaq by referring to Walīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik used this term for some of the Umayyads's caliphs.

ومن عبد شمس انت سادس ستة خلائف كانوا منهم العمُّ والاب

هداة ومهديين عثمان منهم ومروان وابن الابطحين المطيب[2]

Thou art the sixth caliph among the children of 'Abd al-Shams. Some of thy forefathers such as 'Uthmān, Marwān and Mu'āwiya were guided by Allāh and they guided others too

Farazdaq composed this verse about Sulaymān Ibn 'Abd al-Malik,

فان امامك المهديُّ يهدي به الرحمن من خشي الضَّلالا[3]

Mahdī is standing before thee. He is someone who at Allāh's behest can guide whosoever does not want to be led astray

He also said,

فاجاب دعوتنا وانقَذَنا بخلافة المهديِّ من ضُرٍّ[4]

Allāh accepted our prayers and protected us by His viceroy, Mahdī when we were in trouble

Djarīr composed this verse about Sulaymān,

سليمانُ المبارك قد علمتُم هُوَ المهديُّ قد وضح السبيل[5]

Thou know that Sulaymān is Mahdī, someone who guides thee

The word was attributed to 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz in some other sources as well.[6] Djarīr composed this verse about him,

انت المبارك والمهديُّ سيرته تعصي الهوى وتقوم الليل بالسور[7]

Thou are ominous and thy conduct is just the same as that of Mahdī. Thou art not after carnal desire. Thou spend nights by saying prayer

He also composed this verse about Hishām Ibn 'Abd al-Malik,

---

[1]. Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, vol.XXV, p.53

[2]. Dīwān Farazdaq, vol.I, p.80; al-umawīyyūn wa l-khilāfa. P.22

[3]. Ibid. vol.II, p.99

[4]. Ibid. vol.I, p.262

[5]. Dīwān Djarīr, vol.II, p.771

[6]. See, Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.V, p.333; al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.IX, pp.196, 192; Shadhārāt al-dhahab, vol.I, p.119; al-umawīyyūn wa l-khilāfa, p.23; Tārīkh al-khulafā', pp.235, 234, 233

[7]. Dīwān Djarīr, vol.I, p.416

فقلت لها الخليفه غير شك هو المهديُّ والحكَمُ الرشيد[1]

Then I said thou art Mahdī without doubt. Thou art a ruler who had been guided

Farazdaq said about him,

هو المالك المهديُّ والسابق الذي له اول المجد التليد وآخره[2]

He is Mahdī and superior to others. Praise does solely belong to thee

Referring to these verses, one can say for sure that in addition to these verses there have been some other forged traditions in this regard which all indicate that this word was deeply rooted in Mahdawism and it did not come to common usage simply.

One of the main features of the Umayyads ruling that was mostly based on the holiness of their caliphs was that their rulers were dictators. During the times of the first caliphs, counseling was apparently important in their ruling. But later on people interfered in their ruling and by exerting influence on them they enervated rulers. Once they managed to come to power by force, they became dictators so they could suppress their opponents under the pretext of religion and policy.

Ibn Ṭiqṭaqā described 'Abd al-Malik Marwān by saying, "He was someone who for the first time did not let peasants speak in front of caliphs while previously they could do this."[3]

Suyūṭī said,"He was the first ever one forebode enjoining the good and prohibiting the evil."[4]

In his first sermon 'Abd al-Malik said, "You are asking others to be pious while you forget yourself. I swear by Allāh that I will behead him who tells me to be pious".[5]

By referring to those who wanted him to be the same as Muhādjirūn, he said, "Do not ask me to be the same as them since you are not following them yourself"[6].

---

[1]. Dīwān Djarīr. vol.I, p.228

[2]. Dīwān Farazdaq, vol.I, p.281; al-umawiyyūn wal al-khilāfa, p.24

[3]. al-Fakhrī. p.122

[4]. Tārīkh al-khulafā', p.219

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf(manuscript) vol.I, p.1164 quoted from al-umawīyyūn wa l-Khilāfa, pp.120, 122; al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh, vol.IV, p.522; Fawāt al-wafayāt, vol,II. P.404

[6]. Amālī Qālī, vol.I, p.11; See also al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.VIII, p.316; al-umawīyyūn wa l-khilāfa, p.122

'Abd al-Malik supported Ḥadjdjādj Ibn Yūsuf Thaqafī who was a dictator in Iraq. What he was doing could uncover his despotic policy in ruling.Entering Kūfa, Ḥadjdjādj told people, "The caliph had given me both a lash and a sword to come to you but on my way here I missed the lash so what remained was a sword."[1]

'Abd al-Malik said,"He will not do either what the weak caliph ('Uthmān) or what the flattering caliph (Mu'āwiya) did. He will just use his sword when handling people.[2]Before his death, 'Abd al-Malik told his son, Walīd, to kill those who had not paid allegiance to him.[3] Later on, Manṣūr who himself was also a dictator described 'Abd al-Malik as being a dictator.[4]

When Mu'āwiya Ibn Farra and Ḥadjdjādj went to see 'Abd al-Malik, he asked Mu'āwiya,"What is Ḥadjdjādj doing"?

He replied,"If I tell you the truth, you will kill me. If not, God will punish me".

Then 'Abd al-Malik told Ḥadjdjādj, "Do not torture him instead exile him to Sind."[5]

The Marwānids were well-known for being tyrannical but some of them were somehow better in this regard.

People of the Book including the Jewsh and the Christians have strong cultural influence on the credulous Muslims. This should be discussed in detail somewhere else. What is relevant to our discussion is their roles in the political developments and particularly regarding the issue of caliphate. The credulous Muslims believed that in their Books there are many predictions about them, about their caliphs, even about their names, some events of their lives as well as the sequence of them. What is to be mentioned here is just a brief account of what was happening at that time. The Umayyads caliphs tried, by making use of either what the people of the Book told to the Muslims or words they themselves put into their mouths or any other means, to pretend that their names had been written in the divine Books. This matter was of great importance concerning the legitimacy of their ruling. In addition, they could claim that such and such caliph had been chosen at Allāh's behest. It is said that Mu'āwiya had coveted caliphate once 'Uthmān

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.273

[2]. Tārīkh al-khulafā', p.218

[3]. Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, vol.II, p.280-281; Tārīkh al-khulafā', p.220

[4]. Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nahdj al-balāgha, vol.XV, p.243; and see al-umawīyyūn wa l-khilāfa, p.128

[5]. al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.IX, p.139

consulted with him and others about how to cope with his opponents. During Ḥadjdj rite someone read this verse,

انّ الامير بعده عليٌّ و في الزبير خلف رضيٌّ

Verily 'Alī is Amīr after him and Zubayr, too, is a good successor

Ka'b al-Aḥbār told him,"You are telling lie. Mu'āwiya will succeed 'Uthmān". Then Mu'āwiya was informed about what he had said.

He said to Mu'āwiya,"You will come to power after 'Uthmān".

He was very pleased with what he said to him.[1] Someone whose name was Yūsuf and had embraced Judism prophesied that 'Abd al-Malik would be caliph.[2] Wahb Ibn Munabba on the other hand, called 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz the guilder of the nation.[3] He, just the same as Ka'b al-Aḥbār, quoted some statements from the Books of the Jews and Christians for the Muslims.

Suyūṭī quoted 'Abd Allāh, the son of 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz who had encountered a monk in Djazīra, as saying, "The monk sat down just next to me while he had never sitten next to anyone else."

He told me, "Do you know why I came to meet you?"

He said, "No".

The monk said, "Because of your father since (based on what was written in our books) he is one of the just Imāms."

He is like Radjab among other Ḥarām months are Dhi l-Qa'da, Dhi l-Ḥadjdja and Muḥarram they stand for Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān. Radjab is the other one that is not after Muḥarram. It denotes 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz.[4] Accordingly, the name of those four caliphs-not the name of 'Alī-had been mentioned in the Jewish books. It was also said that 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz had told a Christian,"Who would be the next caliph, based on your books, after Sulaymān"?

"You", he said.[5] Ḥadjdjādj asked him about his successor.

He said,"Someone whose name is Yazīd will be your successor."

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.IV, p.343; al-Nizā' wa l-takhāṣum, p.78; Ansāb al-ashrāf al-djuz' al-rābi', al-Qism al-Awwal, p.495, No, 1278; al-Bad' wa l-tārikh, vol.V, p.208 (There, the word "Mardiyy" was used instead of "Radiyy") al-Kāmil fi l-tārīkh vol.III, p.123, Ka'b al-Aḥbār was one of the advisors and companions of 'Uthmān; see Ansāb ul Ashrāf, al-ajuz' al-Rābi', al-Qism al-Awwal, p.542

[2]. Tārīkh al-khulafā', pp.216-217

[3]. Ibid. p.233

[4]. Tārīkh al-khulafā', p.233

[5]. al-Muwaffaqiyyāt, p.352

Ḥadjdjādj thought that he might be Yazīd Ibn Muhallab so he deposed him.[1]

Khālid Ibn Rib'ī said,"We have founded in Torah that both the earth and the heaven will weep on 'Umar Ibn Abd al-'Azīz's death for forty days."[2] Muḥammad Ibn Ka'b Quraḍī also by bringing an example from the Israelis wanted to warn all of the consequences of disobeying caliphs.[3] It was said that 'Abd al-Malik coined dhms and Dīnārs since Khālid had told him,"O caliph! the Jewish and Christian scholars told me that according to their books whosoever among caliphs carves the name of Allāh on coins, he shall be long-lived." Thereafter, he, for the first time, minted Islamic coins.[4]

Observing these cases, the common people among the Muslims who were mostly affected by the predictions of the people of the Book justified the legitimacy of the Umayyads rulers. Referring to Ayyūb, the son of Sulaymān Ibn 'Abd al-Malik, Djarīr who was an eminent poet of the Umayyads composed these verses,

انت الخليفه للرّحمن يعرفه اهلُ الزَّبور وفي التوراة مكتوب

الله فضّلــه والله وفّقــــهُ توفيق يوسف اذا وصاه يعقوب[5]

Thou art Allāh's Viceroy. The Zoroastrians know thee and thy name had been written in Torah. Allāh had favored thee.Thou art just the same as Yūsuf who became triumphant after his father's will, would be triumphant too

It was also said that the Umayyads caliphs were of the opinion that their names had been written in Torah. Those who were familiar with the divine Books of both the Jewish and Christians had the same opinion.

At the end, it seems appropriate to go over the treaty signed by Walīd Ibn Yazīd for the heir apparentship of his sons Ḥakam and 'Uthmān. This treaty is a minute text which can reflect some of the formal beliefs of the government. At the outset, he elucidated prophets' mission up to the time when Allāh appointed Muḥammad(s) as a prophet. It was after him, when his caliphs pursued his course of action. Allāh's caliphs came one after the other on the basis of what Allāh bestowed from the prophets' heritage and

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.VI, pp.393-94

[2]. Tārīkh al-khulafā', p.245

[3]. Rabi' al-abrār, vol.II, p.843-844, see also About Muḥammad Ibn Ka'b to, Qiṣṣikhānān dar tārikh Islām, (Story-tellers in the History of Islam), pp.69-68

[4]. al-Nuqūd al-islāmīyya, p.11, there is much to say in this regard, see al-'Iqd al-munīr fī mā yata'alluq bi l-dirham wa l-danānīr.

[5]. Dīwān Djarīr, vol.I, p.349

offered that caliphate. Allāh destroyed everyone who took a stand against their right, and exterminated everyone who was separated from their company, and made the caliphs dominate everyone who disparage their sainthood and considered Allāh's Judgment concerning them of a different kind, and made them a lesson for others. Allāh treated those being out of the obedience ordered by him like this. Up to this point, the conquest of all anti-Umayyads rebellions is deemed to be a reason for the Umayyads' rightfulness.

Thereupon, for the purpose of setting forth the place of caliphate he noted the verse of human being succession and angels' objection and correlated it with caliphate by stating, "Thus, through caliphate Allāh preserves whatever is on the earth and via obedience makes humans prosperous. And Allāh knows that nothing is stable and strong unless Allāh keeps His truth through an obedient servant, resettles His work, and hinders (the people) from disobedience, keep from unlawful matters and defends His limits. And everyone who profits by this obedience, is Allāh's friend, and the obedient of His orders, and the one guided by Allāh."

Afterwards, with further elaboration he points out the significance of obedience stating, "It is through obedience that the prosperous attain their position, and via disobedience, Allāh destroy the misled, rebellious and blind ones."

He intermingled Allāh's obedience together with that of caliphs. Afterwards he spoke of "treaty" by which he meant that very heir apparent ship. A treaty whose consolidation was inspired to caliphs by Allāh, so that there would remain a hope and means of unity and intimacy amongst the people and the Satan would give up the hope of demolishing religion. This treaty is indicative of Islam integrity and is amongst Allāh's great grace the bondman has made indispensable for the servants. A matter through which Allāh hampered the people from disunity, destroyed hypocrisy and kept them from any disparity. Further, there has been more explanations on the significance of "treaty". Then he said, Amīr al-Mu'minīn, Commander of the Faithful, (Walīd) regarded nothing of much more importance than his treaty since Allāh has granted caliphate, inasmuch as he knew its position in Muslims' work and at present asks Allāh to make him succeed in this work. Amīr al-Mu'minīn is of the belief that he ought to have two treaty in succession. Afterwards, he made reference to his two sons Ḥakam and 'Uthmān and appointed them to heir apparentship one after the other.[1] The most salient point of this treaty is that attending to heir apparentship has been deemed a momentous matter and a God-given gift maintaining the security and reverence of the believers' community. This importance is to

[1]. Tārikh al-ṭabarī, vol.VII, pp.219-224 (a report like translation)

the extent that he regarded it as a taken of Islam integrity.[1] Belief in predestination and sanctifying caliphate has been repeatedly mentioned in the treaty. As it's been pointed out, Allāh's obedience has been considered the same as caliph's obedience, on the grounds that it was Allāh who appointed caliphs as His Viceroys on the earth and who inspired them with the idea of heir apparentship.

SCHOLARS SERVE ĀL MARWĀN

At Umayyads's era, science was confined to al-Hadith, tradition, knowledge incorporating juristic, ethical, historical and interpretative narrations. After the death of the Prophet's companions, just a few people showed some interest in science. Inasmuch as the time was not prone for such a matter; besides, Umayyads didn't show an interest in that. After a long time, it comes to the mind of some people that they collect religious narrations and accounts so that it may be safeguarded against deviation and defilement. The order to this action was issued by 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz at the beginning of the second century A.H.[2] And this very fact indicates the strong neglect of the leaders to the religious science. In Mu'āwiya times and after him, various types of heresy and deviation in religion didn't trigger any opposition. The reason behind this was that the people were not that acquainted with the religious science to resist this matter. Mu'āwiya and Ḥadjdjādj[3] went on with their efforts to revive the wrong religious traditions founded by 'Uthmān and the others. In the meantime, on account of lack of attention to science in this era, even the people took no notice of the religious rules of which they were in the utmost need.[4] A number of traditions were in scholars' hands; however, afterwards this number reached to one million.[5] This very fact showed how the forgotten tradition of the Prophet(s) was compensated by hadith making in the next one or two centuries. Umayyads were to be blamed for this, under the auspices of

---

[1]. Compare with the verse, اليوم اكملت لكم دينكم "This day have I perfected for you, your religion" According to some traditionists and in the view of Shi'ites Imāms and Imāmiyya scholars, refers to Imām 'Alī (a) Imamate. Perhaps that's because of a sort of apposition, that they have put aside the stipulated Imamate which is indicative of religion integrity and replaced it with heirapparentship.

[2]. al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq, vol.IX, p.221

[3]. Murūdj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.146; al-Iḍāḥ, p.182

[4]. See, al-Aḥkām fī Usūl al-aḥkām, vol.II, p.131; Naḍrat 'Āmma fī tārīkh al-fiqh al-islāmī, p.10; al-imām al-Bāqir (a), vol.I, pp.215-216; Dirāsāt wa buḥūth fī l-tārīkh wa l-islām, vol.I, p.56-57

[5]. See, Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ, whenever confronted by a reciter, Dhahabī counted the number of his traditions, and in this way the number increased.

whose government no attention was paid to science, and they tried to lead the people to whatever path they wish through the policy of keeping them ignorant.[1]

In the meantime, most if those having acquaintance with the Islamic science get to serve al-Marwān. Although a large number of those having Shi'ites tendencies and being, for the most part, among Iraqi scholars, fought against Umayyads.

Amongst the assenters, Muḥammad Ibn Muslim Ibn Shahāb Zuhrī (124 A.C.) who was taken thoroughly in the service of Umayyads ought to be mentioned.

At the time when he went along with one of Umayyads rulers to Abū Ḥāzim, one of the last companions of the Prophet, Abū Ḥāzim told him sarcastically, "At times Banū Isrā'īl went along the right path and the rulers were in need of the scholars ... however, as the rascals acquiring knowledge went to the rulers, the rulers got needless of them."

Zuhrī standing aside Sulaymān, the son of 'Abd al-Malik said, "It seems that you mean me in my action."

"That's what you've heard!" Replied Abū Ḥāzim.[2]

For the most part, he dealt with Hishām Ibn 'Abd al-Malik. Hishām paid his heavy loans,[3] and sent his sons to him for education in return for this service of Zuhrī. Furthermore, before him, his brothers as well as 'Abd al-Malik have given him financial assistance.[4] The sister of this very Zuhrī told the people not to believe in Zuhrī speech. For, he has exchanged his religion for this worldly life and is working for the Umayyads.[5] Afterwards in the future, those admitting the Umayyads's Islam, lauded Zuhrī tremendously. Ibn Taymiyya said that Zuhrī safeguarded Islam for 70 years.[6] And it was undoubtedly obvious that this Islam was the one liked y the Umayyads. Before him a lot of people were in the service if the Umayyads, making hadith for them, such as Samura Ibn Djundab and Abū Hurayra.[7] At any rate, Zuhrī was among those interested in Hishām and other Umayyads,[8] and

---

[1]. See, Dirāsāt wa buḥūth fī l-tārikh wa l-islām, vol.I, p.56

[2]. al-Imāma wa l-siyāsa, vol.II, pp.108-109

[3]. Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ, vol.I, p.109;al-Madjrūḥīn, vol.I, p.40; Shadhārāt al-dhahab, vol.II, p.162

[4]. loc.cit.

[5]. Ansāb al-ashrāf(footnote), vol.I, p.26

[6]. Shadhārāt al-dhahab, vol.I, p.163

[7]. See, al-Idāḥ, p.210; Abū Hurayra; Sayyid Sharaf al-Dīn, pp.42-45

[8]. In this regard and other information concerning Zuhrī see, Tārikh Abī Zar'at al-dimashqī, vol.II, p.538, Turāthunā magazine, No.23, pp.9-27

was trying to propagate deviating beliefs. It has been said that Zuhrī and ʻAwāna Ibn Ḥakam who was follow of ʻUthmān as well, relied upon predestination religion specifically.[1]

It's interesting that Ibn Ḥibbān said, "I knew no tradition narrated by Zuhrī concerning the virtues of Imām ʻAlī by heart."[2]

Among other narrators being in the service of the family of Marwān, one can refer to Ibrāhīm Nakhaʻī.

It's been narrated from Ibn ʻAwn that, كان ابراهيم ياتي الأمراء ويسألهم الجوائز "Ibrāhīm always came to the rulers calling them for awards."

According to what another one has written about him, Ibrāhīm himself offered some gifts to the rulers![3] Abu l-Zanād, Medina jurist, was among the narrators and Qur'ān reciters who had some relationships with Hishām Ibn ʻAbd al-Malik.[4] Mughīra Ibn Muqsam is among other Qur'ān-reciters who was the follower of ʻUthmān and treated Imām ʻAlī (a) aggressively as well.[5]

Amongst the renowned Qur'ān reciters and narrators in the service of the Umayyads, Shaʻbī ought to be pointed. He took part in ʻAbd al-Raḥmān revolt; however, later on was pardoned through surrendering himself to Ḥadjdjādj and spent the rest of his life alongside him and ʻAbd al-Malik,[6] making up untrue stories with regard to marring the face of some of Shiʻite Muslims, such as Mukhtār, which Ṭabarī has collected in his book. Also ʻAbd Allāh Ibn ʻUmar who lived up to Ḥadjdjādj times was more or less confirmed, particularly as ʻAbd al-Malik wrote to Ḥadjdjādj that he might obey him.[7] Radjā' Ibn Ḥaywa, another narrator has been referred to as "Shiykh Ahl al-Shām", Shiykh of Damascus people, and "Kabīr al-Dawla al-Umawiyya"[8], the great of the Umayyads government. He was one of ʻAbd al-Malik Ibn Marwān's relatives and it's been said that he was in charge of the financial affairs when the rocks of Bayt al-Muqaddas, Jerusalem, were being built.[9] Wellhausen brought forth a description of his impression on ʻAbd al-Malik government and his sons Walīd and Sulaymān

---

[1]. al-tārīkh al-ʻarabi wa l-muʼarrikhūn, vol.I, p.173

[2]. al-Madjrūḥīn, vol.I, p.258

[3]. Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ, vol.I, p.72

[4]. Ibid, vol.I, p.135

[5]. Ibid, vol.I, p.145

[6]. Ibid, vol.I, p.78

[7]. Djāmiʻ bayān al-ʻilm, vol.I, p.146

[8]. Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ, vol.I, p.118

[9]. Ansāb al-ashrāf, p.209; qtd in, Tārīkh al-dawlat al-ʻarabiyya, Wellhausen, p.209

and has pointed out how he instigated Sulaymān to appoint 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz as his successor.[1]

The only service these people were in a position to give was the forgery of those hadiths, traditions, which could be of benefit for the adherents of this family regarding dispraising the Umayyads's foes and narrating their own dignity. Hadith-narration with regard to obeying the caliphs under any circumstances,[2] and being much efficient practically were among the rights of which they won't be put on trial by Allāh,[3] on account of their being caliphs. When Yazīd Ibn 'Abd al-Malik wanted to act in accordance with 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz's conduct after him, forty old men confirmed that, ما على الخلفاء حساب ولا كتاب "Caliphs won't be questioned of their deeds."[4]

The son of Abū Mūsā Ash'arī, i.e. Abū Burda was among the other scholars dependent upon the Umayyads; who became a judge after the death of Kūfa judge, Shurayḥ.[5] Among the dominant duties of such hadith-reciters, were to consolidate the position of Quraysh among the Arabs, and to make some hadith aimed at justifying the unjust discrimination considered lawful by the Umayyads, regarding the superiority of Arabs over non-Arabs. A hadith such as, قدموا قريشاً ولا تقدموها "Precede the Quraysh and never let it precede you"[6] was the continuation of a policy exerted by Sulaymān Ibn 'Abd al-Malik who ordered those addressing Quraysh abusively to be whipped.[7]

Refuting the traditions narrated by Iraqi scholars and calling them hadith forgers was on the agenda of the Umayyads court.[8] The reason behind this perhaps is that Imām 'Alī (a)'s hadiths were usually circulated in Iraq and this was not satisfying for the Umayyads.

In contrast with those scholars serving the Umayyads in Ḥidjāz or Damascus and sometimes even Iraq, a mass of Kūfiyān scholars, both those being pure Shi'ite Muslims or Mutashayyi', a newly converted Shi'ite Muslims, on no account did they deal with the Umayyads, and instead they put their efforts into preserving the correct traditions. Amongst these

---

[1]. Tārikh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, pp.256-257

[2]. Tārikh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, al-Muṣannaf, vol.I, pp.229-230

[3]. Tārikh al-Khulafā', p.223

[4]. Ibid. p.246

[5]. Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ, vol.I, p.95

[6] Tārikh Baghdād, vol.II, p.61

[7]. al-Fā'iq fī Gharīb al-ḥadīth, vol.I, p.135

[8]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.VI, p.342

traditions typically is, those with respect to the Prophet's Household's virtues which have been preserved, for the most part, by Iraqi traditionalists. It is noteworthy that the Iraqi were not generically the followers of 'Uthmānī religion, and were interested in Imām 'Alī (a) and the household of the Prophet; even so they cannot be deemed Shi'ite Muslims, although they were called so traditionally. Anyhow, amongst these scholars so many were not compatible with the Umayyads and took part in the riots at every opportunity. The participation of a large number of Iraq scholars in Ibn Ash'ath as well as Zayd Ibn 'Alī revolution demonstrates the power of such a position among Iraqi scholars.

CIRCULATION OF ISRAELITES AND THE PREVALENCE OF STORY-TELLING

Among the momentous difficulties of the Islamic culture during the first century A.H., is the penetration of Israelites which have left deep marks at extensive dimensions in both cultural and political areas, to the extent that during 14 centuries its impacts have constantly remained in the thoughts and various interpretive, historical, theological and juristic writings.

The first person being tremendously active in this path was 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sallām, one of the Jewish scribes who embraces Islam at the Prophet's (s) time. Sources as well as compilers of traditions have got so many of his narrations concerning the circulation of Jew culture among Muslims. Ka'b al-Aḥbār was more prominent than him, and given the influence he had on the second caliph[1], impressed so many companions of the Prophet(s) who narrated traditions, and was able to induce more pernicious damages to the Islamic culture and defile the world of tradition by his baseless narrations from the Jewish books. He was even highly praised by Mu'āwiya.[2] 'Akrama, one of the Mawālīs of 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abbās, a prominent traditionist has called him "Rabbānī Hādhi al-Umma", "The Devine of this nation".[3] Among the companions of the Prophet(s), Abū Hurayra and 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Amr respected him more than the others, to the extent that in some cases Abū Hurayra ascribed his narrations to the Prophet(s) aiming to make them common. In our discussion of the caliphate of the second caliph, we will speak of Ka'b al-Aḥbār in detail.

---

[1]. Previously we've discussed this in noting the mental life of the second caliph

[2]. Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.II, p.358

[3]. Ibid, vol.II, p.370

Ka'b al-Aḥbār's actual inheritor was Wahb Ibn Munabba in the late first century and the beginning if the second century. According to what Zuhrī has written about him, he has got tremendous knowledge of the people of the book, and extremely favored in this regard.[1] Wahb traditions have been compiled in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim and Bukhārī through Wahb's brother, Hammām, who himself was the narrator of traditions of Abū Hurayra being himself under the influence of Ka'b al-Aḥbār.[2]

Taking into account the multi-dimensional relationship of Abū Hurayra, Ka'b al-Aḥbār, Wahb Ibn Munabba, and Hammām Ibn Munabba demonstrates their contribution to the circulation of He was the Ka'b al-Aḥbār of his time, and Ka'b al-Aḥbār is the most knowledgeable of the people of his time. And now, what sort of a person is Wahb himself, having access to both sciences?!", said Dhahabī about Wahb.[3] كان كثيرا ينقل من كتب الاسرائيات "He frequently narrated from Israelites books."[4]

Wrote Dhahabī elsewhere about him. It's been narrated, by Wahb himself, that he first believed in predestination; however, having read seventy or so heavenly books, he recanted these beliefs.[5] Elsewhere it's been noted that he has studied 92 heavenly books.[6] Ibn 'Imād Ḥanbalī has written about him, كان شديد الاعتناء بكتب الاولين واخبار الملاحم وقصصهم بحيث كان يشبه بكعب الاحبار في زمانه "He took great heed of the books of the primacy people and accounts of the bloody fights as well as their stories, to the extent that he resembled Ka'b al-Aḥbār in his time."[7]

After some years, Wahb gained such a high position in Sunnites culture that they narrated from the Prophet(s), يكون في أمتي رجل يقال له وهب يهب الله له الحكمة [8] "There will be a man among my nation called Wahb, to whom Allāh will grant sagacity."

He was definitely not heedless of the Umayyads, and he regarded 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz as Mahdī al-Maw'ūd.[9]

---

[1]. Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ, vol.I, p.101

[2]. loc. cit

[3]. loc.cit.

[4]. Mīzān al-i'tidāl, vol.IV, p.353, Mu'djam al-udabā', vol.XIX, p.259

[5]. loc.cit.

[6]. Shadjarāt, vol.I, p.150; Mu'djam al-udabā', vol.XIX, p.259; Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, vol.V, p.543

[7]. Shadjarāt, vol. I, p.150

[8]. al-Madjrūḥīn, vol.I, p.176

[9]. Tārīkh al-Khulafā', pp.233-235

The Umayyads policy not only didn't hinder the publication of Israelian articles and writings, but it did confine it as well. The Umayyads rulers derived many benefits from their knowledge for the popularization and application of their political thoughts in the society. Mu'āwiya himself had a Christian counselor namely Sirdjawn Ibn Manṣūr. He was that very person whom Yazīd once made his doorkeeper and showed him a treaty – whether true or lie – from Mu'āwiya, so that if the people in Kūfa revolt, he would commission 'Ubayd Ibn Ziyād to go to Kūfa. Afterwards, Sirdjawn Ibn Manṣūr became the counselor of Marwān Ibn Ḥakam as well.[1] It seems likely that, his son was responsible for the crucial duty of writing about the army and the tribute.[2] According to some other records, Mu'āwiya has reconstructed a ruined church.[3] If need be, the caliphs referred to the narrations amongst whose narrators was Zuhrī, with regard to the virtue of Bayt al-Muqaddas, Jerusalem.

When Mecca was in 'Ubayd Ibn Ziyād's hand, Damascus people were faced with difficulty during their pilgrimage to Mecca. According to Ya'qūbī, 'Abd al-Malik prevented them from going on pilgrimage to Mecca, inasmuch as Ibn Zubayr compelled them to pledge allegiance to him as the Muslims' caliph. When opposed to, 'Abd al-Malik told the people that Ibn Shahāb Zuhrī quoted from your Prophet to you, لا تشد الرحال الا الي ثلاثه مساجد, المسجد الحرام ومسجدي ومسجد بيت المقدس وهو يقوم لكم مقام الكعبه "Pack not off but towards the mosque: al-Ḥarām mosque, al-Nabī mosque and al-Aqṣā mosque."

It is the roach thereon the Holy Prophet allegedly stood during his ascension. Take it in lieu of Ka'ba. Having built a dome for and hung curtains around it, 'Abd al-Malik compelled the people to go around it as they do around Ka'ba. Such a rite had been performed during the Umayyads time.[4] According to Ibn Khallakān people had congregated there on the day of 'Arafa (the 9th day of Dhi l-Ḥadjdja when the pilgrims perform specified actions in 'Arafāt).[5] It might not have been explicitly mentioned in Arabic sources that performing Ḥadjdj in Bayt al-Muqaddas (Jerusalem) had been 'Abd al-Malik's initiation but the only pieces of information reported had been circumambulating around the rock as well as its holiness. Nevertheless, in non-Arabic sources, Europeans, it is precisely stressed that it had been

---

[1]. al-'Iqd al-farīd, vol.V, p.141

[2]. Ibid, vol.V, p.148

[3]. See, Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.I, pp.205-228 (Leiden); al-Tanbīh wa l-Ishrāf, pp.302-307 (Leiden) quoted in Tārīkh al-Dawlat al-'arabiyya

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.II, p.261; al-Bidāya wa l-nihāya, vol.VIII, pp.280, 281; Ḥayāt al-ḥayawān, vol.I, p.66

[5]. Wafayāt al-a'yān, vol.III p.72

'Abd al-Malik's order. Utikhyus, one of the first historians in Europe had written it in his book called Annales.[1] This action manifests how the Israelites had been made use of with the Umayyads's policies side by side.

To hold Bayt al-Muqaddas in esteem, both 'Abd al-Malik and Ḥadjdjādj had committed themselves to building two portals for it. The one built by 'Abd al-Malik was burnt to a crisp by a thunderbolt later. Ḥadjdjādj wrote to him that the following Qur'ānic verse was about them

واتْلُ عَلَيْهِم بنا بني آدم بالحقّ اذْ قَرّبا قُرْباناً فَتَقُبّل مِنْ أحَدِهما وَلَمْ يتَقَبّلْ من الآخر[2]

"And relate to them the story of the two sons of Adam with truth when they both offered an offering, but it was accepted from one of them and was not accepted from the other."

Any other cases concerning the impacts on 'Abd al-Malik through people of the Book are reported.[3] During his long (twenty-year) rule over the oriental Islamic lands, Ḥadjdjādj was not secure from the scientific dignity of people of the Book therefore, he reinforced their influence on the community through being impressed with them. One of them dates back to the year 84 when he founded the town of Wāsiṭ motivated by a Christian monk's prophecy as stated by Ṭabarī. While he had stopped there, accompanied by his troops, he noticed a monk crossing the Tigris and urinating towards his mule at the same time. Dismounting from his mule, the monk removed the polluted soil and threw it in out the river. Ḥadjdjādj called him and asked about the reason. He responded that he had read in their books that in this very place a mosque would be built and Allāh would be worshipped as long as there were monotheists on that earth. Accordingly, Ḥadjdjādj laid the foundations for the town of Wāsiṭ there and founded the principal mosque of the town in....[4]

The phrase "we have read in our books that ..." was common while narrating the Israelites statements. Some day when Ḥadjdjādj was on his way to Damascus to meet 'Abd al-Malik, he asked a monk whether he had read anything regarding the present status in their books.

He answered, "Yes".

He asked again, "By name or description?"

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, p.206

[2]. Wafayāt al-'ayan, p.206

[3]. Ibid. vol.VII, pp,681-781

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, pp.184,185

"Sometimes by name without description and sometimes vice versa," replied the monk. After a series of questions, Ḥadjdjādj asked about his successor. The answer was that a man called Yazīd would succeed him.

"While I am dead or alive"? he asked.

"I do not know", he answered.

Ḥadjdjādj asked, "Give a description of him!"

"He would be treacherous to you," said the monk, "I know nothing more".

Remembering Yazīd Ibn Muhallab, Khurāsān governor, who was also ousted later.[1] There is a strong probability that some merely with the aim of deposing Yazīd had conspired to incite the monk to utter such absurd talks.

The Christian's penetration into the Umayyads's administration under the name of amanuenses and so on and so forth cleared the way for the Israelites expansion. Mothers of some rulers were Christian bondwomen, in their turns, influential in disseminating Christian culture in Muslim community. Since Khālid Ibn 'Abd Allāh Qasrī's mother was a Christian, Khālid was accused of his religion while being an Umayyads governor in Mecca and Iraq for years. He had built a synagogue for his mother to worship. Concerning him, Farazdaq had composed,

وكيف يؤم الناس من كانت أمّه تدين بـــان الله ليس بواحـــــد

بني بيعة فيها الصليب لامّـــــه ويهدم من بغض منارالمساجد[2]

How can he ever be a leader for a nation while his mother is unbeliever in monotheism? The man who had built a synagogue having a cross for her and has ruined the minarets of the mosques spitefully

According to Iṣfahānī, Khālid had been accused on his father's side as well, one of whose forefathers had been a Jew joining the tribe of Budjayla.[3] Even Hishām had accused him of heeding more to Christians and Zoroastrians and apportioning properties among them.[4]

Khālid Rib'ī, well-acquainted with the Israelites, had said,"We found in Torah that sky and the earth had shed tears for forty days after 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz".[5]

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī vol.V, p.191

[2]. Wafayāt al-a'yān, vol.II, p. 229; concerning ruining the minarets see Rabī' al-abrār, vol.I, p. 328

[3]. al-Aghānī, vol.V, p. 17; Wafayāt al-a'yān, vol.II, p. 230

[4]. al-Muwaffaqiyyāt, p. 292

[5]. Tārīkh al-khulafā', p. 245

Walīd Ibn ʻAbd al-Malik also paid much attention to the Qur'ān recites of Bayt al-Muqaddas. As stated by Ibn Abī ʻUlba, Walīd had given many pieces of jewelry to him to distribute among them.[1] A study of Islamic history can reveal hundreds of impacts that Christian and Jewish culture have had on Sunnites culture.

It has been also said why ʻAbd al-Malik had for the first time coined was that he had been told that based on their books, the followers of the divine Books had been of this opinion that the caliphs who sanctified Allāh on the coins would outlive.[2]

Imāms took a position against such beliefs. Imām ʻAlī (a) had stated,

"Anyone who has got a book from the early nations should dispose it as soon as he can."[3] It was while these kinds of books had been spread among Muslims. Imām Ṣādiq also in his turn reproached those scholars after the Israelites.[4] Earlier, we noticed how Imām Sadidjād prohibited Ḥasan Baṣrī from recounting stories. It was exactly the continuation of the Prophet's policy that had emphasized,

لا تسألوا أهل كتاب عن شيء[5]

Never ever ask the followers of the divine Books any question

These people made efforts to recount the stories respecting the former prophets which had been distorted in Jewish books and usually contained many insults at them as well as false narrations in terms of scholastic theology and jurisprudence. It was already addressed that story-telling became prevalent from caliph II onward. Later, during ʻUthmān's time, telling the Prophet's stories based on Jewish books while interpreting the Qur'ānic verses prevailed more than before. Once Muʻāwiya urged a story-teller to stand up after the prayer and curse Imām ʻAlī.[6] The policy of cursing ʻAlī (a) was carried on during the Umayyads's tenure by the story-tellers too. When the caliphs realized that the story-tellers needed to be under control, they fabricated some hadiths according to which story-tellers should have worked under the caliph's supervision and personally appointed them in order to pursue their own political and cultural aims. It was the story-tellers who spread false hadiths among people and had even more influence on people than hadith-narrators. Surprisingly, regardless of their

---

[1]. Ibid. p. 224

[2]. al-Nuqūd al-islāmīyya, al-Miqrīzī, p.11

[3]. Djāmiʻ bayān al-ʻilm, vol.I, p. 72

[4]. Biḥār al-anwār, vol.II, p. 108

[5]. al-Īḍāḥ, p. 311 (published by Tehran University).

[6]. Qiṣṣi khānān dar tārīkh Islām, p. 46

influence on Sunnites's religious culture, hadith-narrators rejected them saying that it they are told one hadith they will multiply it.[1] The caliphs were mainly proponents of the story-tellers and as mentioned above they themselves appointed and dismissed them. Almost all stories dealt with the narrations made by the followers of the divine Books and were all discussed in detail elsewhere.[2]

CONQUESTS BY THE MARWĀNIDS UNTIL LATE FIRST CENTURY

Although conquests had been somewhat resumed during the time of Yazīd Ibn Mu'āwiya, in this 60s and until even 73 when Ibn Zubayr was overthrown, they were halted. However, the ground was repaved for them subsequent to establishment of 'Abd al-Malik's broad-based government and Ibn Zubayr's fall.

The conquests were limited to several areas, One was in theast including both transoxania and Sīstān and the other in the western lands of Islam including Northern Africa and Northern Iraq and Syria called Armenia. Bearing this fact in mind that no consensus is reached on the date of conquests and the quality of their report which have been mingled with irrelevant epics, we present a concise report respecting these conquests.

ORIENTAL CONQUESTS

When 'Umar was caliph, the conquests in oriental lands of Islam peaked following the overthrow of the Sassanids Empire. Arabs who considered the conquests as a mission for expanding Islam and wiping off non-Muslims did not content themselves with the Sassind's overthrow and advanced towards the vast Khurāsān, half of which is now in Iran and the rest in Afghānistān and Middle Asian republics, so fast that they reached Transoxania. After years of clashes with the local dynasties in such lands, Arabs could after all spread the religion deeply as near as China. It is worth saying that aside from the motivation of both caliphs and rulers of the aforesaid areas as well as the people to battle against non-Muslims, a desire for gaining spoils was of central importance in Muslim's resistance too.

Khurāsān was under the Sassanids's power then. Nevertheless, the more it was advanced towards the east, the less their influence grew and the stronger the local rulers became. The residents of that land were like Turks in Iranians' view. As soon as the conquests crossed the border of Khurāsān,

---

[1]. Ibid. pp. 86-96

[2]. Ibid. pp. 65-72

Iranians became motivated to cooperate. By the same token, the Iranian's all-out presence beside Arabs in the conquests was eye-catching in the last quarter of the first century.

Although the impediments facing Arabs in such lands were by no means few, their strength in defeating the Sassanids as a superpower together with Islamic attraction and Muslims's treatment could undermine the residents. Professor Gip commented, "Since Arabs' dominance often followed neither murder nor plunder and they contented themselves with the paid Djizya after the capture, the town was evacuated immediately with no serious resistance."[1]

The existing disputes among the local rulers were another reason for the fragility of these lands and consequently facilitative for Muslim Arabs. Muslims's attack to Transoxania had in essence begun during Mu'āwiya's time by Ziyād, Iraqi governor, in the early 50s.

In 51 A.H. he was set to send 50000 Arab families residing in Baṣra and Kūfa out to Khurāsān[2] in order to materialize his aim which was stabilization of conquests. The urgency of these Arabs' presence for developing and stabilizing the conquered area was crystal clear. Furthermore, such a movement could precede a number of lateral problems for Muslims one of which was the protracted dispute among the Arab tribes in Khurāsān, the origin of most clashes.

The strife between the Mudrids and Rabi'a in Khurāsān had ended in many deep-rooted conflicts. While Ibn Zubayr in power, 'Abd Allāh Ibn Khāzim, from among the Qaysids, was the governor. Succeeding Ibn Zubayr's suppression by 'Abd al-Malik, 'Abd Allāh was asked to stay there at 'Abd al-Malik's demand. He declined however. 'Abd al-Malik as a consequence invoked Bukayr Ibn Wishāḥ, an agent of 'Abd Allāh's in Marw who accepted the request. In a battle between him and 'Abd Allāh Ibn Khāzim, Ibn Khāzim was killed and 'Abd al-Malik could succeed in dominating that land as well.[3]

No sooner had 'Abd Allāh Ibn Khāzim been appointed by Ibn Zubayr as Khurāsān governor than the clashes among Arabs in Khurāsān had Turks dare advance as near as Niyshābūr.[4] The clashes among the Arab residents of Khurāsān were so prolonged even after Ibn Khāzim's death that both Sīstān and Khurāsān were also entrusted to Ḥadjdjādj. Proficient enough during the war with the Khāridjites, Muhallab Ibn Abī Ṣufra was appointed

---

[1]. Futūḥāt a'rāb dar āsiyāy markazī, p. 41

[2]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p. 400

[3]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, pp. 21, 22; Futūḥ al-buldān, p. 405

[4]. Futūḥ al-buldān, pp. 404, 405

by him in 78 to govern Khurāsān. The governorship of Muhallab's family father and two sons, Yazid and Mufaḍḍal) in that land lasted about nine years. Nevertheless, following the grudge Ḥadjdjādj bore this family, he ousted them and substituted Qutayba Ibn Muslim for them. In 80, concurrent with the attack Muhallab had launched on Kashsh, he stayed there for two years and combated non-Muslims. According to Ṭabarī, since there had been no probability of conquest for him, his one and the only desire was to return the army safe and sound to Marw.[1]

Muhallab who passed away in 82 on his way back from Kashsh was replaced by his son, Yazīd. In 84, an influential Turk in a fort in Bādaghays to whom Yazīd had laid siege had to hand over the entire treasure of the fort in a compromise to him and leave with his family.[2]

Ḥadjdjādj affected by an eminent follower of the divine Books suspected Yazīd Ibn Muhallab in 85 and designated his brother, Mufaḍḍal, in place.[3] As Yazīd himself had perceived, such a measure was merely for impairing this family's influence and eventually wiping them off the political face of Khurāsān and even oriental lands. During his nine-month ruler, Mufaḍḍal invaded Bādaghays and besides conquering it, he brought spoils. Such conquests of Muhallab's family appeared petty compared with those of Qutayba Ibn Muslim who stepped in Khurāsān in 86. At the same time 'Abd al-Malik died and his son, Walīd, succeeded him. He was the one throughout whose age the greatest conquests were made reminiscent of the primary stages of conquests. Qutayba carried on conquering for nearly ten years during which he endeavored to capture the lands in Transoxania whether south or north of Amudarya (Djiyḥūn). Both Ṭabarī and Balādhurī have addressed these conquests in their books but the analysis of them is beyond the scope of this chapter.[4] The reports respecting such issues are evaluated by professor Gibbwithin four units, Restitution of Takhāristān (86), Conquest of Bukhārā (87), Growth of influence (91) and Military Expedition to the provinces[5] with Qutayba's death, conquests were halted for a long time although Arabs were still dominant. Embracing Islam had gradually become so prevalent that the conversion of a number of monarchs to Islam by 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz's[6] invitation set the scene for the caliphs' absolute dominance.

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 139

[2]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, pp. 186, 187

[3]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 191

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, the events during 88-95; Futūḥ al-buldān, pp. 409-411

[5]. Futūḥāt a'rāb dar āsiyāy markazī, from p. 52 on

[6]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p. 415

Qutayba's conquests in the Orient reached China the most noticeable areas of which were Shāsh and Farghāna; however, Arab dominance in that land was exposed to change. They all occurred during the last years of his life, 94 and 95. As soon as he learned Ḥadjdjādj's death, he relinquished conquering, upset, and returned to Marw[1]. As reported by Narshakhī the principal mosque of Balkh was founded in 94[2] indicative of Islam's widespread in the cities of Islamic land. Southern transoxania from Kābul to the south and from Kirmān province in Iran to the east was called Sidjistān. Two abortive attacks of Arabs one by 'Abd Allāh Ibn Umayya and the other by 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Abī Bakra have been reported by Balādhurī. As far as the mountainous position of the area was concerned, the monarch named Ratbīl or Zanbīl could each time force Muslim Arabs to withdraw.[3] When Ḥadjdjādj dispatched an army headed by 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Ash'ath to Sidjistān in 80, Zanbīl asked for a compromise but 'Abd al-Raḥmān declined. Arabs could conquer a large part of Sidjistān and gain spoils subsequent to Zanbīl's withdrawal.[4] Contenting himself with these numbers, 'Abd al-Raḥmān informed Ḥadjdjādj of his decision. Ḥadjdjādj urged him, nevertheless, to keep on conquering. 'Abd al-Raḥmān as well as the Iraqis who had a potential dissatisfaction with Ḥadjdjādj revolted discussed elsewhere in detail. After being defeated, 'Abd al-Raḥmān sought refuge by Zanbīl but in an agreement and under Ḥadjdjādj's threat 'Abd al-Raḥmān's head was sent to him under the conditions of a seven-year or nine-year truce and indemnity. As this period passed by Ashhab Ibn Bishr traveled there on Ḥadjdjādj's behalf but his harsh behavior toward Zanbīl made him send him back. Dominant in Khurāsān and Sidjistān, Qutayba Ibn Muslim sent his brother, 'Amr, to Sidjistān. Muslims' former defeats in that land which had cast a spell over it according to 'Amr resulted in a compromise. When Zanbīl felt that Muslims had no longer the ability to attack there, he discontinued paying to the rulers succeeding Ḥadjdjādj.[5] In 94, Muslims could advance toward India by the Sea of 'Ummān and conquer a part of it in addition to Sidjistān, under Zanbīl's rule.[6] Among the Indian key cities conquered first by Muslims in 95 was Multān. Until then modern western Pakistan had entirely been governed by Muslims.[7]

---

[1]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 263

[2]. Futūḥāt a'rāb dar āsiyāy markazī, p. 65

[3]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p. 390, 391

[4]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, pp. 141-142; Futūḥ al-buldān, p. 391

[5]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p. 392

[6]. Tārīkh al-ṭabarī, vol.V, p. 257

[7]. Impirāṭūriyyat al-'arab, p. 260

OCCIDENTAL CONQUESTS

The conquering of Egypt was the start of Muslim conquests in Africa and their penetration into Spain. Egypt was conquered late during 'Umar's caliphate in 20 and 21 A.H. Two years later Tripoli was conquered but not staying there, Muslims came back to Barqa. After a while, the civil wars waged among Muslims had them miss the chance of more conquests in Africa. Muslim disputes in that land were mostly with the rulers designated by East Roman Emperor for Egypt, Ifrīqiya (modern Tunasia) and littoral areas of the Mediterranean. Although the local tribes called Barbars were among the greatest obstacles to conquests, they gradually embraced Islam as conquests multiplied. As already discussed, while Mu'āwiya in power, 'Uqba Ibn Nāfi', resumed conquering and established the town of Qīrawān in 50 as a base for Muslims' next conquests. Nonetheless, in an ambush among the Barbarians, he was killed in 64. With successive attacks, he could penetrate into modern Morocco as near as Fās but he was killed en route back.

Once 'Abd al-Malik had suppressed various riots and dominated the whole Islamic lands, conquests in Africa were resumed in 76. At the same time, Ḥasan Ibn Nu'mān launched his conquests by conquering Qarṭādjanna and advanced towards Morocco. Meanwhile, Romans occupied Qarṭādjanna but Ḥasan who could take it back in 79 razed it to the ground not to allow them to infiltrate into it again. This time, the Barbarians united behind a woman, named Kāhina, later, against Muslim Arabs and could succeed to get them to retreat as far as the primary conquests. The only place where Kāhina and the Barbarians were overpowered was Ṭabardja in 83.

To pursue Ḥasan Ibn Nu'mān's conquests, Mūsā Ibn Nuṣayr resumed them in Africa in 86 and consequently conquered modern Morocco wholly. At the same time, as the Barbarians have been gradually embracing Islam the ground was getting fully prepared for Arabs' through dominance in northern littoral lands of Africa.[1] 'Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwān was the caliph until then who was succeeded by his son Walīd whose endeavors in conquests were the most considerable among the former caliphs according to Suyūṭī.

One of the commanders of Mūsā Ibn Nuṣayr's army was Ṭāriq Ibn Ziyād who has been allegedly a Barbarian although what his father's name indicated was that he might have converted to Islam long time ago. Due to his excellent competence as a commander, Ṭāriq overstepped the bounds of North Africa and took Muslims to Spain for the first time in 93. A year later Mūsā Ibn Nuṣayr set out to Spain as well and maintained the act of

---

[1]. Imbirāṭūriyyat al-'arab, p. 214

conquering there. Among the conquered lands were Ṭulayṭala, Mārida, etc. Most areas with no war surrendered to Muslims and as a result Spain became entirely Muslim Arabs'.

Walīd's death in 97 and his succession by Sulaymān made Mūsā Ibn Nuṣayr return to Damascus and be blacklisted by the Umayyads. He wished he had pursued conquests in Italy and France through Spain and then in Greece and constantinople. Walīd's death as well as his deposal, however, caused Arabs to remain in Spain and even entrust the land to the Europeans after a couple of centuries.

Armenia was among the lands the conquests of which had been begun from 'Umar's time and had been under heavy clashes in the late first century. A vast land was called Armenia by Muslims. Balādhurī has divided it into four parts including such cities as Shimshāṭ, Qālīqalā, Busfurdjān, Dubayl, Djurzān and Sidjistān.[1]

When 'Uthmān in power, Ḥabīb Ibn Maslama Fihrī attacked Qālīqalā and not only he conquered it but also based on a treaty the residents were duty-bound to pay Djizya(tributes).[2] Tiflīs, Eastern Armenia, was also surrounded by Ḥabīb. While 'Abd al-Malik and Ibn Zubayr were in clashes, the residents of such areas appreciated the opportunity and revolted, but they were suppressed after some time and ruled by the Umayyads.[3] During Walīd's and Sulaymān's age many attacks were made on the Roman central territory. Although in their attacks they even reached as near as the gates of Constantinople, Muslims could never succeed in conquering it.

In a nutshell, it can be said that Muslims lost their primary magnificence from the late first century but in return Romans resumed their attacks and were still superior in the second century. Nevertheless, they could by no means conquer Eastern Rome entirely. It was done by 'Uthmānids later in the 10th century after Hidjra.

---

[1]. Futūḥ al-buldān, p. 197

[2]. Ibid. p. 203

[3]. Ibid. pp. 207-208

REFERENCES

1) ʻAṣr al-nabī, Muḥammad ʻIzza Darwaza, Beirut, 1964
2) ʻAlī Ibn al-Ḥusayn, Djaʻfar Shahīdī, Tehran, Daftar Nashr Farhang Islāmī
3) ʻAqīdat al-salaf Aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth, Abū Uthmān Ismāʼīl Ibn ʻAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ṣābūnī, Edited by: Badr ʻAbd Allāh al-Badr, Medina, 1415 A.H
4) ʻAwālim al-ʻulūm, Vol 16, ʻAbd Allāh al-Baḥrānī, Qum, Madrisat al-imām al-mahdī
5) Aḥkām al-Qurʼān, Abū Bakr Aḥmad Ibn ʻAlī al-Rāzī al-Djaṣṣāṣ, 1335 A.H
6) Aḥkām al-Qurʼān, Abū Bakr Muḥammad Ibn ʻAbd Allāh Ibn al-ʻArabī, Edited by: ʻAlī Muḥammad al-Bidjāwī, Beirut, 1378 A.H
7) al-Aḥkām al-sulṭāniyya wa l-wilāyāt al-dīniyya, Abu l-Ḥasan ʻAlī Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Ḥabīb al-Māwardī, Qum, 1406 A.H
8) al-Aḥkām al-sulṭāniyya, Abū Yaʻlā Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Farrāʼ, Edited by: Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Fiqī, Qum, 1406 A.H
9) Aḥsan al-taqāsīm, Maqdisī, Laiden, 1906
10) Aʻyān al-shīʻa, Muḥsin al-Amīn, Beirut, Dār al-taʻāruf
11) Aʼimat al-ithnā ʻAshar, ʻĀdil al-adīb, Beirut, Dār al-aḍwāʼ
12) Aʼimmatunā, Muḥammad ʻAlī Dukhayyil, Beirut, Dār al-murtaḍād
13) Aḍwāʼ ʻala l-sunnat al-muḥammadiyya, Maḥmūd Abūrayya, Qum, 1363
14) al-Asnām, Hishām Kalbī, Translated to Persian by: Djalālī Nāʼīnī, Tehran, 1348 Sh
15) Aṭlas Tārīkh al-islām, Ḥusayn Mūnis, Cairo, 1407 A.H
16) Abū Hurayra, al-Sayyid Sharaf al-dīn, Beirut, Dār al-taʻāruf
17) al-Adhkiyāʼ, Abu l-Faradj Ibn al-Djūzī, Najaf, 1389 A.H
18) al-Aghānī, Abu l-Faradj Iṣfahānī, Cairo, 1963
19) Akhbār al-ṭiwāl, Abū Ḥanīfa al-Dīniwarī, Edited by: ʻAbd al-Munʻim ʻĀmir, Cairo, 1960
20) Akhbār al-buldān, Ibn Faqīh Hamadānī, Printed by Fuat Sizgīn
21) Akhbār al-quḍāt, Muḥammad Ibn Khalaf Ibn Ḥayyān Wakīʻ, Beirut, ʻĀlam al-kutub
22) Akhbār Iṣbahān, Abū Nuʻaym Iṣbahānī, Leidan, 1934
23) Akhbār Makka wa mā djāʼ fīhā min al-āthār, Abu l-Walīd Muḥammad Ibn ʻAbd Allāh Ibn Aḥmad al-Azraqī, Edited by: Rushdī *Ṣāliḥ Malḥas, Beirut, 1403 A.H*

24) al-Munammaq fī Akhbār Quraysh, Muḥammad Ibn Ḥabīb al-Baghdādī, Edited by: Khurshīd Aḥmad Fārūq, Ḥaydarābād 1384 *A.H*

25) al-Amālī fī Āṣār al-ṣaḥāba, 'Abd al-Razzāq Ibn Hammām al-Ṣan'ānī, Edited by: Madjdī al-Sayyid Ibrāhīm, Cairo, Maktabat al-Qur'ān

26) al-Amālī, Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Nu'mān, al-Shiykh al-Mufīd, Edited by: Ḥusayn Ustādwalī, 'Alī Akbar Ghaffārī, Qum, 1403 A.H

27) al-Amāli, Abū 'Alī Ismā'īl Ibn Qāsim al-Ghālī, Edited by: 'Abd al-Djawād al-Aṣma'ī, Cairo, 1975

28) al-Amwāl, Abū 'Ubayd Qāsim Ibn Sallām Hirawī, *Cairo, 1335 A.H*

29) Andīshih Siyāsī dar Islām Mu'āṣir, Ḥamīd 'Ināyat, Translated by: Bahā' al-dīn khuramshāhī, Tehran, 1362 Sh

30) Ansāb al-ashraf, Aḥmad Ibn Yaḥyā al-Balādhurī, Vol 1, Edited by: Muḥammad Ḥamīd Allāh, Cairo, Dār al-ma'ārif, Vol 2, 3, Edited by:Muḥammad Bāqir al-Maḥmūdī, Beirut, 1397. Vol 4, 5, Baghdad, Maktabat al-muthannā. Vol 4, Edited by: Iḥsān 'Abbās, Beirut, 1400 A.H

31) al-Ansāb, 'Abd al-Karīm Ibn Muḥammad al-Sam'ānī, Edited by: 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Yaḥya al-Mu'allimī, Ḥaydarābād

32) Asbāb al-nuzūl, Abu l-Ḥasan 'Alī Ibn Aḥmad al-Wāḥidī al-Niyshābūrī, Cairo, 1387 A.H

33) Āthār al-ḥarb fī l-fiqh al-islāmī, Wahba al-zuḥaylī, Damascus, 1401 A.H

34) Athar Ahl al-kitāb fī l-fitan wa l-ḥurūb al-ahliyya fī l-qarn al-awwal al-hidjrī, Djamīl 'Abd Allāh al-Miṣrī, Medina, 1410 A.H

35) al-Awā'il, Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī, Qum, Maktaba Baṣīratī

36) Bīst Guftār, Mahdī Muḥaqqiq, Tehran, 1355 Sh

37) al-Baḥr al-rā'iq, Ibn Nadjīm, 1331 A.H

38) Baḥth fī Nash'at 'Ilm al-tārīkh 'Ind al-'arab, 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Dūrī, Beirut, 1983

39) Baṣā'ir al-daradjāt, Ṣaffār Qummī, Edited by: Mīrzā Muḥsin Kūchih Bāghī Tabrīzī, Qum, 1404 A.H

40) al-Baṣā'ir wa l-Dhakhā'ir, Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, Edited by: Aḥmad Amīn, Aḥmad Ṣaqar, Cairo, 1373 A.H

41) al-Bad' wa l-tārīkh, Muṭahhar Ibn Ṭāhir al-Maqdisī, *Maktabat al-thiqāfat al-dīniyya*

42) Bahdj al-ṣabāgha fī Sharḥ Nahdj al-balāgha, Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī, Tehran, 1390 A.H

43) Bahdjat al-madjālis, Ibn 'Abd al-barr al-Qurṭubī, Cairo, al-Dār al-miṣriyya li l-ta'līf wa l-tardjama

44) Balāghāt al-nisā', Abu l-faḍl Aḥmad Ibn Abī Ṭayfūr, Qum, 1371 Sh

45) al-Bayān wa l-tabyīn, 'Amr Ibn Baḥr al-Djāḥiẓ, Edited by: 'Abd al-Salām Hārūn, Cairo, 1948

46) Bazmāward, 'Abbās Zaryāb Khūyī, Tehran, 1368 Sh

47) Biḥār al-anwār, 'Allāma Muḥammad Bāqir Madjlisī, Beirut, Mu'assisat al-wafā', 1403 A.H

48) al-Bidāyaw a l-nihāya, Ibn Kathīr al-Ḥanbalī, Beirut, 1409
49) al-Biy'a fī l-niẓām al-siyāsī al-islāmī, Aḥmad Ṣiddīq 'Abd al-Raḥmān, Cairo, 1408 A.H
50) Buḥūth fī Tārīkh al-Qur'ān wa 'Ulūma, Abu l-faḍl Mīrmuḥammadī, Beirut, 1400 A.H
51) Bulūgh al-'irab fī Ma'rifat al-'arab, Maḥmūd Shukrī al-Ālūsī, Edited by: Muḥammad Bahdjat al-atharī, Cairo, 1342 A.H
52) al-Buldān, Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Wāḍiḥ Ya'qūbī, Laiden
53) Dā'irat al-ma'ārif al-islāmiyya, 1933
54) Dā'irat al-ma'ārif Buzurg Islāmī, Tehran, Edited by: Muḥammad Kāẓim Budjnūrdī
55) Dīwān al-Farazdaq, Hammām Ibn Ghālib, Beirut, 1385 A.H
56) Dīwān Shiykh al-Abāṭaḥ, Edited by: Abū Haffān 'Abd Allāh Ibn Aḥmad al-Muhzamī, Edited by: Muḥammad Bāqir al-Maḥmūdī, Qum, 1372 Sh
57) Dalāyil al-ṣidq min Faḍā'il Amīr al-Mu'minīn wa Imāmatu, Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Muẓaffar, Qum, 1395 A.H
58) Dalāyil al-nubuwwa, Abū Bakr Aḥmad Ibn Ḥusayn Ibn 'Alī al-Biyhaqī, Edited by: 'Abd al-Mu'ṭī Qal'adjī, Beirut, 1405 A.H
59) Dalāyil al-nubuwwa, Abū Nu'aym al-Iṣbahānī, Edited by: Muḥammad Rawās Qal'adjī, 'Abd al-Barr 'Abbās, Beirut, 1406 A.H
60) al-Daradjāt al-rafī'a, 'Alī Ṣadr Shīrāzī, Tehran
61) Dhakhā'ir al-'uqbā fī Manāqib Dhawī al-qurbā, Muḥibb al-Dīn Ṭabarī, Beirut, Dār al-ma'rifa
62) Dhamhara Ansāb al-'arab, Ibn Ḥazm al-Andulusī, *Cairo, 1391 A.H*
63) Dhamhara Khuṭab al-'arab fī 'Uṣūr al-'arabiyyat al-zāhira, Aḥmad Zakī Ṣafwat, Cairo, 1352 A.H
64) al-Dharī'a Ilā Taṣānīf al-shī'a, 'Allama Shiykh Āghā Buzurg Ṭihrānī, Beirut, 1403 A.H
65) Dhawāhir al-kalām, Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Ṅadjafī, Tehran, 1392 A.H
66) Dhawāmi' al-sīrat al-nabawiyya, Ibn Ḥazm al-Andulusī, Beirut, 1403 A.H
67) Dirāsāt fī Wilāyat al-faqih, Ḥusayn 'Alī Muntaẓirī, Qum, 1408 A.H
68) Dirāsāt wa Buḥūth fi al-tārīkh wa l-islām, Dja'far Murtaḍā, Qum, 1400 A.H
69) al-Djāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ, al-Tirmidhī, Medina, 1964
70) Djāmi' Bayān al-'ilm wa Faḍlih, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr al-Qurṭubī, Cairo, 1979
71) al-Djamal, Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Nu'mān al-Shiykh al-Mufīd, Edited by: al-Sayyid 'Alī Mīr Sharaf al-Dīnī, Qum, 1371 Sh
72) Djamhara Nasab Quraysh wa Akhbāruhā, Zubayr Ibn Bakkār, Edited by: Maḥmūd Muḥammad Shākir, Cairo, 1381 A.H
73) Djazīrat al-'arab fī Qarn al-'ishrīn, Ḥāfiẓ Wahba, Cairo, 1387 A.H

74) al-Durar fī Ikhtiṣār al-maghāzī wa l-siyar, Ibn ʻAbd al-Barr al-Qurṭubī, Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-ʻilmiyya
75) al-Durr al-manthūr, ʻAbd al-Raḥmān al-Suyūṭī, Qum, al-Maktabat al-marʻashī
76) Duwlat wa Ḥukūmat dar Islām, A. K. S. Lambton, Translated by:..., Tehran, ʻUrūdj
77) al-Fāʼiq fī Gharīb al-ḥadīth, Djār Allāh al-Zamakhsharī, Cairo, Maṭbaʻat al-Ḥalabī
78) Faḍl al-Iʻtizāl wa Ṭabaqāt al-muʻtazila, Qāḍī ʻAbd al-Djabbār al-Hamadānī, Edited by: Fuʼād Sayyid, Tūnis, 1393 A.H
79) Fadjr al-islām, Aḥmad Amīn, Cairo, Maktabat Nahḍat al-miṣriyya
80) al-Fakhrī fī l-ādāb al-sulṭāṣniyya wa l-duwal al-islāmiyya, Muḥammad Ibn ʻAlī Ibn Ṭabāṭabā Ibn al-Ṭaqṭaqā, Qum 1414 A.H
81) Fann al-sīra, Iḥsān ʻAbbās, Beirut, Dār al-thiqāfa
82) Farāʼid al-simṭayn, al-Ḥamwīnī, Edited by: Muḥammad Bāqir al-Maḥmūdī, Beirut, 1398 A.H
83) al-Farq Bayn al-firaq, ʻAbd al-Qāhir Ibn Ṭāhir Ibn Muḥammad al-Baghdādī, Edited by: Muḥammad Muḥyi l-Dīn ʻAbd al-Ḥamīd, Beirut, Dar al-maʻrifa
84) Fatḥ al-bārī Bi Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-bukhārī, Ibn Ḥadjr al-ʻAsqalānī, Beirut, 1402 A.H
85) Fawāt al-wafayāt, Muḥammad Ibn Shākir al-kutbī, Edited by: Iḥsān ʻAbbās, Beirut, Dār Ṣadir
86) Fi l-ʻubūr al-ḥaḍārī li l-maktabat al-ʻarabiyyat al-islāmiyya, al-Kitāb al-thānī: Kaʻb al-Aḥbār, Muḥammad ʻAlī Abū Ḥamda, Ummān, Dār al-bashīr, 1411 A.H
87) Fi l-adab al-djāhilī, Ṭāhā Ḥusayn, Cairo, Dār al-maʻārif
88) al-Fihrist, Muḥammad Ibn Ḥasan Ṭūsī, Qum, Raḍī
89) al-Fihrist, Muḥammad Ibn Isḥāq Ibn Nadīm, Edited by:Tadjaddud, Tehran, 1393
90) Fiqh al-khilāfa wa Taṭawuruha li Tuṣbīḥa ʻUṣbat Umam Sharqiyya, ʻAbd al-Razzāq Aḥmad al-Sanhūrī, Cairo, 1989
91) Fiqh al-lugha wa Sir al-ʻarabiyya, Abū Manṣūr Ismāʼīl al-Thaʻālibī, Qum, Ismāʻīliyān
92) Fiqh al-sīra, Muḥammad al-Ghazzālī, Beirut, ʻĀlam al-maʻrifa
93) Firaq al-shīʻa, Abū Muḥammad Ḥasan Ibn Mūsā al-Nuwbakhtī, Edited by: Muḥammad Ṣādiq Āl Baḥr al-ʻulūm, Najaf, 1355 A.H
94) Fitnat al-kubrā, Ṭāhā Ḥusayn, Cairo, Dār al-maʻārif
95) al-Fuṣūl al-muhimma, Ibn Ṣabbāgh Mālikī, Tehran, al-Aʻlamī
96) al-Fuṣūl al-mukhtāra, Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Nuʻmān al-Shiykh al-Mufīd, Qum, Maktabat al-Dāwarī
97) al-Furūq al-lughawiyya, Abū Hilāl al-ʻAskarī, Qum, Baṣīratī

98) Futūḥ al-buldān, Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Yaḥyā al-blādhurī, Edited by:: Riḍwān Muḥammad Riḍwān, Beirut, 1404 A.H

99) Futūḥ Miṣr wa Akhbāruhā, Abu l-Qāsim 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, Baghdad,Maṭba'at al-muthannā, (Leidan, 1912)

100) al-Futūḥ, Abū Muḥammad Aḥmad Ibn A'tham al-kūfī, Ḥaydarābād, 1393 A.H

101) al-Futūḥ, Persian Translation, Translated by: Muḥammad Ibn Aḥmad Ibn Mustuwfī Hirawī, Edited: Ghulām Riḍā Ṭabāṭabāyī Madjd, Tehran, 1372 Sh

102) Futūḥāt A'rāb dar Āsiyāy Markazī, Gib, Translated by: Aḥmadīpūr, Tabrīz

103) Gāhnāmih Taṭbīqī Sih Hizār Sālih, Aḥmad Bīrashk, Tehran, 1367 Sh

104) al-Ghārāt, Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm Ibn Muḥammad al-Thaqafī al-Kūfī, Edited by: Mīr Djalāl al-Dīn Muḥaddith Urmawī, Tehran, 1355 A.H; and Persion version: Translated by: 'Abd al-Muḥammad Āyatī, Tehran, 1371 Sh

105) Ghāyat al-Ikhtiṣār fī al-buyūtāt al-'alawiyya al-maḥfūẓa Min al-ghubār, Ibn Zuhra, Edited by: al-Sayyid Baḥr al-'ulūm, Najaf, 1962

106) al-Ghadīr, 'Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Amīnī, Beirut, 1397 A.H

107) Gharīb al-ḥadīth, Abū 'Ubayd Qāsim Ibn Sallām al-Hirawī, Ḥaydat Ābād, 1384 A.H

108) al-Ḥūr al-'ayn, Nishwān al-Ḥimyarī, Edited by: Kamāl Muṣṭafā, Tehran, 1972

109) Ḥadīth al-thaqalayn Tawātira wa Fiqhu, 'Alī al-Ḥusayn al-Mīlānī, Qum, 1413 A.H

110) Ḥarakat al-tārīkh 'Ind al-imām 'Alī, Muḥammad Mahdī Shams al-Dīn, Tehran, 1405 A.H

111) Ḥayāt al-ḥayawān, Dimyarī, Beirut, al-Maktabat al-islāmiyya

112) Ḥayāt al-ṣaḥāba, al-Kāndihlawī, Ḥalab, 1391 A.H. (Beirut, Dār al-qalam, 1968)

113) Ḥayāt al-imām al-Bāqir, Bāqir Sharīf al-Qurashī, Najaf

114) al-Ḥayāt al-siyāsa li l-Imām al-Ḥasan, Dja'far Murtaḍā, Qum, 1405 A.H

115) al-Ḥayāt al-siyāsa li l-Imām al-Riḍā, Dja'far Murtaḍā, Qum, 1401 A.H

116) Ḥayāt Muḥammad, Muḥammad Ḥusayn Hiykal, Cairo, 1354

117) al-Ḥayawān, Abū 'Uthmān 'Amr Ibn Baḥr al-Djāḥiẓ, Edited by: 'Abd al-Salām Hārūn, Beirut, Dār Iḥyā' al-turāth al-'arabī

118) Ḥilyat al-awliyā', Abū Na'īm Iṣbahānī, Beirut, 1387 A.H

119) al-Ḥukūmat al-islāmiyya fī l-aḥādīth al-shi'a al-imāmiyya, Qum, Fī Ṭarīq al-ḥaqq Institute, 1360 Sh

120) al-Hudā Ilā Dīn al-muṣṭafā, Muḥammad Djawād al-Balāghī, Tehran, 1965

121) Huwiyyat al-tashayyu', Aḥmad al-Wā'ilī, Qum, 1362 Sh

122) al-Īḍāḥ, Faḍl Ibn Shādhān al-Niyshābūrī, Beirut, al-A'lamī. Tehran, Edited by: Muḥaddith Urmawī, 1363 Sh

123) al-'Ibar wa Dīwān al-mubtadā' wa l-khabar, (Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn), Beirut, 1391 A.H

124) al-'Iqd al-farīd, Ibn 'Abdirabbih, Beirut, 1384,
125) al-'Irāq fī l-'aṣr al-umawī, Thābit Ismā'īl al-Rāwī, Baghdad, Maktabat al-Andulus
126) al-Iḥtidjādj, Ṭabarsī, Qum, Quds Muḥammadī
127) I'lām al-warā, Abū 'Alī Faḍl Ibn Ḥasan Ṭabrisī, Tehran, 1390 A.H
128) al-I'lān Bi l-tawbīkh liman Dhamm Ahl al-tārīkh, al-Sakhāwī, translated by: Asad Allāh Āzād, Mashhad, 1410 A.H.
129) al-Iṣāba fī Tamīz al-Ṣaḥāba, Ibn Ḥadjar 'Asqalānī, Cairo, 1328 A.H
130) al-Ifṣāḥ, Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Nu'mān al-Shiykh al-Mufīd, Qum, 1413 A.H
131) Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-ridjāl, (Ridjāl Kashshī), al-Ṭūsī, Edited by: Ḥasan Muṣṭafawī, Mashhad University press
132) Ikmāl al-dīn wa Itmām al-ni'ma, al-Shiykh Ṣadūq, Tehran, 11401 A.H.
133) al-Ilmām, al-Nuwayrī al-Iskandarānī, Ḥaydarābād
134) al-Imām al-Mudjtabā, Ḥasan Muṣṭafawī, Qum, Maktabat al-muṣṭafawī
135) *al-Imama wa l-siyāsa, known by "Tārīkh al-khulafā'", Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh* Ibn Muslim Ibn Qutayba al-Dinwarī, Edited by: 'Alī Shīrī, Qum, 1413 A.H
136) Imbirāṭūriyyat al-'arab, Djulūb, Translated to Arabic by: Khayrī Ḥammād, Beirut, 1996
137) al-Imlā' wa l-istimlā', Sam'ānī, Laiden, 1952 A.H
138) al-Imtā' wa l-mu'ānasa, Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, Edited by: Aḥmad Amīn & Aḥmad al-Zayn, Beirut, Dār al-maktabat al-ḥayāt
139) Imtidād al-'arab fī Ṣadr al-islām, Aḥmad Ṣāliḥ al-'Alī, Beirut, 1403 A.H
140) al-Irshād al-sārī Li Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī, Abu l-'Abbās Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad al-Qasṭalānī, Cairo, Būlāq, 1302 A.H
141) al-Irshād fī Ma'rifa Ḥudjadj Allāh 'ala l-'ibād, Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn al-Nu'mān al-Shiykh al-Mufīd, Edited by: Qum, 1413 A.H
142) al-Ishtiqāq, Ibn Durayd, Baghdad, 1399 A.H
143) Islām Barrisī Tārīkhī, Hamilton A.R. Gibb, Translated by: Manūchihr Amīrī, Tehran, 1409 A.H
144) Islām dar Īrān, Peṭrushifskī, Translated to persian by Karīm Kishāwarz, Tehran, 1397 A.H
145) Isrā'īliyyāt wa Atharuhā fī Kutub al-tafsīr, Ramzī *Na'nā'a, Damascus, 1390 A.H*
146) al-Istī'āb, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr al-Qurṭubī, Beirut, *Dār Iḥyā' al-turāth al-'arabī*
147) al-Ithāf Bi Ḥubb al-ashrāf, al-Shabrāwī, Cairo
148) Ithbāt al-waṣiyya, Mas'ūdī, Qum, al-Raḍī
149) al-kāfī, Muḥammad Ibn Ya'qūb al-Kulaynī, Edited by: 'Alī Akbar Ghaffārī, Tehran, 1388 A.H

150) al-Kāmil fī Ḍu'afā' al-Ridjāl, Ibn 'Uday, Beirut, Dar al-fikr
151) al-Kāmil fī l-lugha wa l-adab, Abu l-'Abbās, Muḥammad Ibn Yazīd al-Mubarrad, Edited by: Baydūn - Nu'aym zar zūr, Beirut, 1407 A.H
152) al-Kāmil fī l-tārīkh, Abu l-Ḥasan 'Alī Ibn Abi l-Karīm Ibn al-Athīr, Beirut, 1385 A.H
153) Kalīlih wa Dimnih, Naṣr Allāh Munshī, Edited by: Mudjtabā Minawī, Tehran, Amīr Kabīr
154) Kashf al-ẓunūn, Ḥādjī Khalīfa, Beirut, 1402 A.H
155) Kashf al-astār 'An Musnad al-bazzār, al-Hiythamī, Beirut, 1399 A.H
156) Kashf al-ghumma, 'Alī Ibn 'Īsā al-Irbilī, *Tabrīz*
157) Kashf al-irtiyāb, Muḥsin al-Amīn, Fifth Edition
158) al-Kashshāf, Abu l-qāsim Djār Allāh Ibn Maḥmūd Zamakhsharī, Beirut, Dār al-ma'rifa
159) al-Khaṣā'iṣ al-kubrā, Djalāl al-dīn al-Suyūṭī, Cairo
160) al-Kharādj wa Ṣinā'at al-kitāba, Qudāma Ibn Dja'far, Edited by: Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Zubaydī, Baghdad, 1981
161) al-Khawāridj wa l-shī'a, wellhausen, Translated to persian by: 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Badawī, Kuwait, Wikālat al-maṭbū'āt
162) al-Khiṭaṭ al-miqrīziyya, Abu l-'Abbās Aḥmad Ibn 'Alī Miqrīzī, Beirut, Dār Ṣādir
163) Khilāfat wa Mulūkiyyat, Abu l-A'lā Muwdūdī, Translated by: Khalīl Aḥmad Ḥāmidī, Pāwih, 1405 A.H
164) *Kifāyat al-athar fi l-naṣṣ 'Alā* 'A'imat al-ithnā 'Ashar, 'Alī Ibn Muḥammad Ibn 'Alī Ibn Kharrāz Qummī, Edited by: 'Abd al-Laṭīf al-Ḥusaynī al-Kūhkamarī, Qum, 1401 A.H
165) Kitāb al-'ulūm (Amālī Aḥmad Ibn 'Īsā Ibn Zayd), Edited by: Muḥammad Ibn Manṣūr Ibn Yazīd al-Murādī
166) Kitāb al-bukhārī, Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad Ibn Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī, Beirut, Dār al-ma'rifa
167) Kitāb Muslim, Muslim Ibn Ḥadjdjādj, Beirut, 1407 A.H
168) Kitāb Sulaym Ibn Qays, Najaf
169) al-Kunā wa l-alqāb, 'Abbās al-Qummī, Qum, Bīdār
170) Lisān al-'arab, Muḥammad Ibn Mukarram Ibn al-Manẓūr, Beirut, 1408 A.H
171) Lisān al-mīzān, Ibn Ḥadjar al-'asqalānī, Beirut, 1390 A.H
172) Lubāb al-albāb, Ibn Munqidh, Cairo, 1354 A.H
173) Lubāb al-nuqūl, Djalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, Beirut, 1978
174) Mālikiyyat Khuṣūṣī Zamīn, 'Alī Aḥmadī Miyāndjī, Qum, 1404 A.H
175) Mīzān al-i'tidāl, Shams al-Dīn Dhahabī, Beirut, 1382 A.H
176) al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān, Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Ṭabāṭabāyī, Tehran, 1397 A.H

177) al-Maḥāsin wa al-masāwī, Muḥammad Ibn Ibrāhīm al-Biyhaqī, Beirut, 1390 A.H

178) Ma'ādin al-ḥikma, Muḥammad Ibn Fiyḍ al-Kāshānī, Edited by: 'Alī al-Aḥmadī, Qum, 1407 A.H

179) al-Ma'ālim al-athīra fī al-sunna wa l-sīra, Muḥammad Ḥasan Sharāb, Beirut, 1411 A.H

180) Ma'ālim al-khilāfa fī l-fikr al-siyāsī al-islāmī, Maḥmūd al-Khālidī, Beirut, 1404 A.H

181) Ma'ālim al-Madrisatayn, Murtaḍā al-'Askarī, Tehran, 1412 A.H

182) Ma'ālim al-tawḥīd, Dja'far al-Subḥānī, Tehran, 1400 A.H

183) Ma'ānī al-akhbār, Abū Dja'far Muḥammad Ibn 'Alī Ibn al-Ḥusayn Ibn Babiwayh al-Shiykh al-Ṣadūq, Edited by: 'Alī Akbar Ghaffārī, Qum, 1403 A.H

184) al-Ma'ārif, Ibn Qutayba al-Dinwarī, Edited by: Tharwa 'Ukkāsha, Cairo, dār al-ma'ārif, Qum, 1415

185) al-Ma'rifa wa l-tārīkh, Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb Ibn Sufyān al-Basawī, Edited by: Akram Diyā' al-'Umarī, Baghdād, 1394 A.H

186) Ma'rifat al-ṣaḥāba, Abū Na'īm al-Iṣfahānī, Edited by: Muḥammad Rāḍī Ibn Ḥādj 'Uthmān, Medina, 1408 A.H

187) Mab'ūth al-Ḥusayn, Muḥammad 'Alī 'Ābidīn, Qum, 1404 A.H

188) al-Madjdī fī Ansāb al-ṭalibīyyīn, Nadjm al-Dīn Abi l-Ḥasan 'Alī Ibn Muḥammad al-'Alawī, Edited by: Aḥmad Mahdawī Dāmghānī, Qum, 1409 A.H

189) Madjmū'at al-wathā'iq al-siyāsiyya fi al-'ahd al-nabawī wa al-khilāfa al-rāshida, Muḥammad Ḥamīd Allāh al-Ḥaydarābādī, Cairo, 1941

190) Madjma' al-amthāl, al-Miydānī, Beirut, Dār Maktabat al-ḥayāt

191) Madjma' al-bayān, Abū 'Alī Faḍl Ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭabrisī, Tehran, Maktabat al-'ilmiyyat al-islāmiyya

192) Madjma' al-zawā'id wa Manba'al-fawā'id, Nūr al-Dīn 'Alī Ibn Abī Bakr al-Hiythamī, Beirut, 1967

193) al-Madjrūḥīn, Ibn Ḥibbān, Edited by: Ibrāhīm Zāyid, Damascus, Dār al-wa'y

194) Madkhal Tārīkh Sharq Islāmī, Jan Suvaje, Translated by: Nūsh Āfarīn Anṣārī, Tehran, 1407 A.H

195) al-Maghāzī al-Ūlā wa Mu'lifūhā, Translated by: Ḥusayn Naṣṣār, Cairo, Maṭba'at al-Ḥalabī

196) Maghāzī Rasūl Allāh li 'Urwa Ibn Zubayr, Edited by: Nūr Sayf, Beirut

197) Makātīb al-rasūl, 'Alī al-Aḥmadī, Qum, 1404 A.H

198) Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭālib, Ibn Shahr Āshūb, Qum, Muṣṭafawī

199) al-Maqālāt wa l-firaq, Sa'd Ibn 'Abd Allāh Ash'arī, Edited by: Muḥammad Djawād Mashkūr, Tehran, 1360

200) Maqāmāt al-'ulamā' Bayn Yaday al-khulafā' wa l-umarā', Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad al-Ghazzālī, Edited by: Muḥammad Djāsim al-ḥadīthī, Baghdad, 1988

201) Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn, Abu l-Faradj al-Iṣfahānī, Edited by: Kāẓim al-Muẓaffar, Najaf, al-Ḥaydariyya, 1405 A.H; Other printed Edited by: Aḥmad Ṣaqr, Qum, 1414 A.H

202) Maqtal al-imām Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib, Abū Bakr 'Abd Allāh Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Abi l-Dunyā, Edited by: Muḥammad Bāqir al-Maḥmūdī, Tehran, 1411 A.H

203) Marāṣid al-iṭṭilā', al-Baghdādī, Cairo, 1373 A.H

204) Masā'il al-imāma wa Muqtaṭafāt Min al-kitāb al-awsaṭ fi al-maqālāt, Edited by: Van Ess, Beirut, 1971

205) al-Mi'yār wa l-muwāzina fī Faḍā'il Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib, Abū Dja'far al-Iskāfī, Edited by: Muḥammad Bāqir al-Maḥmūdī, Beirut, 1399 A.H

206) al-Milal wa l-nihal, al-Shahristānī, Edited by: Muḥammad Fatḥ Allāh Ibn Badrān, Qum, 1405 A.H

207) Min Dawla 'Umar ilā Dawla 'Abd al-Malik, Ibrāhīm Bayḍūn, Beirut, 1411 A.H

208) Min Tārīkh al-adab al-'arabī, Ṭāhā Ḥusayn, Beirut, 1981

209) Muḥāḍarāt al-udabā', Rāghib al-Iṣfahānī

210) al-Muḥabbar, Muḥammad Ibn Ḥabīb al-Baghdādī, Beirut, Dār al-āfāgh al-djadīda, (India 1361 A.H)

211) Mu'allaqāt Sab', Translated to persian by: 'Abd al-Muḥammad Āyatī, Tehran, 1390 A.H

212) Mu'djam al-buldān, Yāqūt Ḥamawī, Beirut, 1399 A.H

213) Mu'djam al-ma'ālim al-djughrāfiyya, 'Ātiq Ibn Ghayth al-Bilādī, Mecca, 1402 A.H

214) Mu'djam al-udabā', Yāqūt Ḥamawī, Beirut, 1400 A.H

215) Mu'djam Qabāyil al-'arab, 'Umar Riḍā Kaḥḥāla, Beirut, Mu'assisat al-Risāla

216) al-Muṣannaf fī l-aḥādīth wa l-āthār, Abū Bakr 'Abd Allāh Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Abī Shayba, Edited by: Kamāl Yūsuf al-Ḥūt, Beirut, 1409 A.H

217) al-Muṣannaf, 'Abd al-Razzāq Ibn Hammām al-Ṣan'ānī, Edited by: Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-A'ẓamī, Beirut, 1392 A.H

218) Mudhakkir wa l-tadhkīr wa l-dhikr, Aḥmad Ibn 'Amr al-Shaybānī, Edited by: Khālid al-Radādī, Riyāḍ, 1413 A.H

219) al-Mufaṣṣal fī tārīkh al-'arab Qabl al-islām, Djawād 'Alī, Beirut, 1980

220) Mufradāt Alfāẓ al-Qur'ān, al-Rāghib al-Iṣfahānī, Tehran, Maktabat al-Murtaḍawiyya

221) al-Mukhtaṣar fī Akhbār al-bashar, 'Imād al-Dīn Ismā'il (Abu l-fidā'), Beirut, Dār al-ma'rifa

222) Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh al-'arab wa l-tamaddun al-islāmī, al-Sayyid Amīr 'Alī, Translated to Arabic by: Riyāḍ Ra'fat, Cairo, 1938
223) Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq, Muḥammad Ibn Mukarram Ibn al-Manẓūr, Damascus, 1988
224) al-Muntakhab Min Dhayl al-mudhayyal, Muḥammad Ibn Djarīr al-ṭabarī, Cairo, Dār al-ma'ārif
225) Muqadama fī Tārīkh Ṣadr al-islām, 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Dūrī, Beirut, 1960
226) Muqaddamihyī Bar Tārīkh Tadwīn Ḥadīth, Rasūl Dja'fariyān, Qum, 1411 A.H
227) al-Muqni' fī l-imāma, 'Abd Allāh Ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Sudd Ābādī, Edited by: Shākir Shabs', Qum, 1413 A.H
228) Murdjī'a, Tārīkh wa Andīshih, Rasūl Dja'fariyān, Qum, 1414 A.H
229) Murudj al-dhahab wa Ma'ādin al-djuwhar, Abu l-Ḥasan 'Alī Ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Mas'ūdī, Beirut, 1358 A.H
230) Musnad al-imām al-Kāẓim, 'Azīz Allāh al-'Uṭārudī, Mashhad, Āstān Quds Raḍawī
231) al-Musnad, Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal, Beirut, Dār Ṣādir
232) al-Musnad, Ibn Dja'd
233) al-Mustadrak 'Ala al-vasā'il, Mīrzā Ḥusayn al-Nūrī, Qum, Mu'assesat Āl al-bayt
234) al-Mustadrak 'Ala l-ṣaḥīḥayn, Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Niyshābūrī, Ḥaydarābād, 1342 A.H
235) al-Mustarshid fī l-imāma, Muḥammad Ibn Djarīr al-Ṭabarī al-Shī'ī, Najaf, al-Ḥaydariyya
236) al-Muwaṭṭā', Mālik Ibn Anas, Edited by: Muḥammad Fu'ād 'Abd al-Bāqī, Beirut, Dār Iḥyā' al-turāth al-'arabī
237) al-Muwaffaqiyyāt, Zubayr Ibn Bakkār, Edited by: Sāmī Makkī al-'Ānī, Baghdād, 1392
238) al-Muzhir, Djalāl l-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, Edited by: Muḥammad Aḥmad Djād al-mawlā, Cairo, Dār Iḥyā' al-kutub al-'arabiyya
239) Nūr al-abṣār, Muḥammad Mu'min al-Shablandjī, Cairo, Maṭab'at al-Yūsifiyya
240) Naẓm durar al-simṭayn fī Faḍā'il al-muṣṭafā wa l-murtaḍā wa l-batūl wa l-sibṭayn, Djamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn Yūsuf Ḥanafī Madanī, Edited by: Muḥammad Hādī al-Amīnī, Tehran, Maktabat Niynawā
241) al-Naṣā'iḥ al-kāfiya li man Yatawallā Mu'āwiya, Muḥammad Ibn 'Aqīl, Qum, Dār al-thiqāfa
242) Nahdj al-balāghà, Translated to persian by: Dja'far Shahīdī, Tehran, 1414 A.H
243) Nahdj al-sa'āda fī Mustadrak Nahdj al-balāgha, Muḥammad Bāqir al-Maḥmūdī, Beirut, 1397 A.H
244) Nasab Quraysh, Muṣ'ab al-Zubayrī, Cairo, Dār al-ma'ārif
245) Nathr al-durr, Abū Sa'īd al-Ābī, Cairo, 1981

246) Niẓām al-ḥukūma al-nabawiyya al-musammā , (al-tarātīb al-idāriyya), ʻAbd al-ḥayy al-kattānī, Beirut, Dār al-kitāb al-ʻarabī

247) Niẓām al-ḥukm fī l-islām, Muḥammad Fārūq al-Nabhān, Beirut, 1408 A.H

248) Niẓām Wilāyat al-ʻahd wa Wirāthat al-khilāfa fī al-ʻaṣr al-umawī, Ḥusayn ʻAṭwān, Beirut, 1411 A.H

249) al-Nihāya fī Gharīb al-ḥadīth wa l-athar, Abu l-Sādāt Mubārak Ibn Muḥammad al-Djazarī Ibn al-Athīr, Edited by: Ṭāhir Aḥmad al-Zāwī, Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Ṭannāḥī, Qum, 1364

250) Nihāyat al-irab fī Funūn al-adab, Shahāb al-Dīn Aḥmad Ibn ʻAbd al-Wahhāb al-Nuwayrī, Cairo, 1342 A.H

251) al-Nizāʻ wa l-takhāṣum Fīmā Bayn Banī Umayya wa Banī Hāshim, Taqī al-Dīn al-Miqrīzī, Edited by: Ḥusayn Mūnis, Qum, 1412 A.H

252) al-Nuqūd al-islāmiyya, Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad Ibn ʻAli al-Miqrīzī, Najaf, al-Ḥaydariyya, 1387 A.H

253) *Pazhūhishī Darbarih Naqsh Dīnī wa* Idjtimāʻī Qiṣṣih Khānān Dar Tārīkh Islām, Rasūl Djafariyān, Qum, 1412 A.H

254) Piyāmbar Ummī, Murtaḍā Muṭahharī, Qum, Ṣadrā

255) Piykār Ṣiffīn, Naṣr Ibn Muzāḥim Minqarī, Translated by: Parwīz Atābakī, Tehran, 1408 A.H

256) al-Qādisiyya, Aḥmad ʻĀdil Kamāl, Beirut, 1404 A.H

257) Qāmūs al-ridjāl, Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī, Tehran, 1397 A.H

258) Qiṣih Khānā dar Tārīkh Islām, Rasūl Djafariyān, Qum, 1412 A.H

259) al-Quṣāṣ wa l-mudhakkirīn, ʻAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn al-Djūzī, Edited by: Qāsim al-Sāmirrāʼī, Riyāḍ, 1403 A.H

260) Rabīʻ al-abrāb wa Nuṣūṣ al-akhbār, Abu l-Qāsim Maḥmūd Ibn ʻUmar al-Zamakhsharī, Qum, 1369 A.H

261) al-Radda, Muḥammad Ibn ʻUmar al-Wāqidī, Edited by: Yaḥyā al-Djubbūrī, Beirut, 1410 A.H

262) Rasāʼil al-djāḥiẓ, ʻAbd al-Salām Hārūn, Cairo, 1964

263) Rasāʼil al-djāḥiẓ, Edited by: ʻAlī Abū Malḥam, Beirut, 1987

264) Rasāʼil Ibn Ḥazm, Edited by: Iḥsān ʻAbbās, Beirut, 1987

265) al-Rawḍ al-unuf, Abu l-Qāsim ʻAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn ʻAbd Allāh al-Khathʻamī, Edited by: Ṭāhā ʻAbd al-Raʼūf Saʻd, Cairo, Maktabat al-kulliyyāt al-Azhariyya

266) Rawḍat al-Wāʻiẓīn, Fattāl Niyshābūrī, Najaf, 1386

267) Rawish Shinākht Islām, ʻAlī Sharīʻatī, Madjmūʻa Āthār, N. 27, Tehran

268) Ridjāl al-nadjāshī, Aḥmad *Ibn ʻAlī Ibn Aḥmad al-Nadjashī al-Asadī al-Kūfī, Edited by: Mūsā Shubayrī Zandjānī, Qum,* 1407 A.H

269) Riyāḍ al-ʻulamāʼ, Mīrzā ʻAbd Allāh Afandī, Edited by: Aḥmad Ḥusaynī, Qum, 1401 A.H

270) Ruwḍāt al-djannāt, Muḥammad Bāqir al-Iṣfahānī al-Khānsārī, Qum, Ismāʼīliyān

271) al-Ṣaḥīḥ Min Sīrat al-nabī al-aʿẓam, Djaʿfar Murtaḍā, Qum 1403 A.H
272) Ṣaḥīfa Sadjdjādiyya, al-imām ʿAlī Ibn al-Ḥusayn
273) Ṣifat al-ṣafwa, Abu l-Faradj Ibn al-Dhūzānī, Damascus, 1390 A.H
274) Ṣubḥ al-ʾAʿshā fī Ṣināʿat al-inshāʾ, Abū al-ʿAbbās Aḥmad Ibn ʿAlī al-Qalqashandī, Cairo, 1383 A.H
275) Ṣulḥ al-Ḥasan, Āl Yāsīn, Baghdad, Dār al-kutub al-ʿarāqiyya
276) Ṣulḥ al-imām al-Ḥasan, Muḥammad Djawād Faḍl Allāh, Beirut, Dār al-ghadīr
277) al-Sīra al-nabawiyya, Ziynī Daḥlān, Printed with al-Sīrat al-ḥalabiyya, Beirut
278) Sīra Rasūl Allāh, ʿAbbās Zaryāb Khūʾī, Tehran, 1412 A.H
279) Sīra wa Qiyām Zayd Ibn ʿAlī, Ḥusayn Karīmān, Tehran, 1402 A.H
280) al-Sīrat al-ḥalabiyya, (Insān al-ʿuyūn fī Sīrat al-amīn al-maʾmūn), ʿAlī Ibn Burhān al-Dīn al-Ḥalabī, Beirut, al-Maktabat al-Islāmiyya
281) al-Sīrat al-nabawiyya, Abu l-Fidāʾ Ismāʾīl Ibn Kathīr, Edited by: Muṣṭafā ʿAbd al-Wāḥid, Beirut, 1407 A.H
282) al-Sīrat al-nabawiyya, Ibn Hishām, Edited by: Muṣṭafā al-Saqqāʾ, Beirut, Dār al-maʿrifa
283) Samṭ al-nudjūm al-ʿawālī, ʿAbd al-Malik Ibn Ḥusayn al-ʿIṣāmī, Cairo, 1380 A.H
284) al-Saqīfa wa Fadak, Abū Bakr Aḥmad Ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Dhuwharī, Edited by: Muḥammad Hādī al-Amīnī, Tehran, Niynawā
285) al-Shām fī Ṣadr al-islām, Nadjda Khumāsh, Damascus, 1987
286) al-Shūrā fī l-ʿaṣr al-umawī, Ḥusayn ʿAṭwān, Beirut, 1410 A.H
287) Shadharāt al-dhahab fī Akhbār Man Dhahab, Ibn al-ʿImād al-Ḥanbalī, Beirut, Dār Iḥyāʾ al-turāth al-ʿarabī
288) al-Shahīd Muslim Ibn ʿAqīl, ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Muqarram, Najaf
289) Sharḥ Nahdj al-balāgha, Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd, Edited by: Muḥammad Abu l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm, Cairo, 1387 A.H
290) Sharḥ Uṣūl al-khamsa, Qāḍī ʿAbd al-Djabbār Hamadānī, Cairo, 1385 A.H
291) Sharaf Aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth, Abū Bakr Aḥmad Ibn ʿAlī Ibn Thābit al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Edited by: Muḥammad Saʿīd Khaṭīb Ūghlī, Ankara, 1971
292) Shiʿr al-khawāridj, Edited by: Iḥsān ʿAbbās, Beirut, 1974
293) al-Shiʿr wa l-shuʿarāʾ, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh Ibn Muslim Ibn Qutayba al-Dīnwarī, Beirut, Dār Ṣādir
294) Siyar Aʿlām al-nubalāʾ, Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī, Beirut, Muʾassisat al-Risāla
295) al-Siyar wa l-maghāzī, Muḥammad Ibn Isḥāq, Edited by: Suhayl Zakkār, Beirut, 1398 A.H
296) Subul al-hudā wa l-rashād fī Sīra Khayr al-ʿibād, Muḥammad Ibn Yūsuf al-Ṣāliḥī al-Shāmī, Edited by: Muṣṭafā ʿAbd al-Wāḥid, Cairo, 1392 A.H

297) Sunan al-dārimī, Abū Muḥammad ʻAbd Allāh Ibn Bahrām al-Dārimī, Beirut, 1398 A.H

298) Sunan al-kubrā, Abū Bakr Aḥmad Ibn Ḥusayn al-Biyhaqī, Ḥaydarābād, 1344 A.H

299) Sunan al-nasā'ī, Abū ʻAbd al-Raḥmān Aḥmad Ibn Shuʻayb Ibn ʻAlī al-Nisā'ī, Beirut, Dār al-fikr

300) Sunan Ibn Mādja, Abū ʻAbd Allāh Muḥammad Ibn Yazīd al-Qazwīnī Ibn Mādja, Edited by: Muḥammad Fu'ād ʻAbd al-Bāqī, Beirut, Dār Iḥyā' al-turāth al'arabī

301) al-Sunna, Abū Bakr Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Hārūn Ibn Yazīd al-Khallāl, Edited by: ʻAṭiyya al-Zahrānī, Riyāḍ, 1415 A.H

302) Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, Muḥammad Ibn Saʻd, Beirut, 1405 A.H

303) Ṭabaqāt al-muḥaddithīn Bi Iṣbahān, Abū Muḥammad ʻAbd Allāh Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Djaʻfar Abu l-Shiykh al-Anṣārī, Edited by: ʻAbd al-Ghafūr ʻAbd al-Ḥaqq, Beirut, 1412 A.H

304) Ṭabaqāt al-shuʻarā', Muḥammad Ibn Sallam al-Djumaḥī, Beirut, 1968

305) Ṭabaqāt Fuḥūl al-shuʻarā', Muḥammad Ibn Sallām Djumaḥī, Edited by: Maḥmūd Muḥammad Shākir, Cairo, 1400 A.H

306) al-Ṭarā'if Fī Maʻrifa Madhāhib al-ṭawā'if, Ibn Ṭāwūs, Qum, Maktabat al-Khayyām

307) al-Ṭarīq ila l-madā'in, Aḥmad ʻĀdil Kamāl, Beirut, 1404 A.H

308) Tādj al-ʻArūs, Muḥammad Murtaḍā al-Ḥusaynī al-Zubaydī, Beirut, 1385 A.H

309) Tārīkh Ṣadr al-islām wa l-duwlat al-umawiyya, ʻUmar Farrūkh, Beirut, Dār al-ʻilm li l-Malāyīn

310) Tārīkh Īrān az Islām tā Salādjiqih, Vol 4, Edited by: R.N.Fray, Translated by: Ḥasan Anūshih, Tehran, 1401 A.H

311) Tārīkh Īrān dar Qurūn Nukhustīn Islāmī, Bertold Spuler, Translated by: Djawād Falāṭūrī, Tehran, 1404 A.H

.312) Tārīkh al-ʻarab fī l-islām, Djawād ʻAlī, Qum, 1413 A.H

313) Tārīkh al-ʻarab wa l-islām Mundh Mā Qabl al-mabʻath wa Ḥattā Suqūt Baghdād, Suhayl Zakkār, Beirut, 1397 A.H

314) al-Tārīkh al-ʻarabī wa l-Mu'arrikhūn, Shākir Muṣṭafā, Beirut, 1983

315) Tārīkh al-adab al-ʻarabī (al-ʻAṣr al-djāhilī), Shuwqī Ḍayf, Cairo, 1960

316) Tārīkh al-adab al-ʻarabī, R. Blacher, Translated by: Ibrāhīm al-Kīlānī, Damascus, 1973

317) Tārīkh al-djahmiya wa l-muʻtazila, Djamāl al-Dīn al-Qāsimī, Cairo, 1331

318) Tārīkh al-duwlat al-ʻarabiyya, Wellhausen, Cairo, 1958

319) Tārīkh al-islām wa Wafayāt al-mashāhīr wa l-iʻlām, Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī, Edited by: ʻAbd al-Sallām Tadmurī, Beirut, 1407 A.H

320) al-Tārīkh al-kabīr, Abū ʻAbd Allāh Ismāʻīl Ibn Ibrāhīm al- Bukhārī, Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-ʻilmiyya

321) Tārīkh al-khulafā', Djalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, Edited by: Muḥammad Muḥy al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd, Cairo, 1371 A.H

322) Tārīkh al-madīnat al-munawwara, Abū Zayd 'Umar Ibn Shabba al-Numayrī, Edited by: Fahīm Muḥammad Shaltūt, Qum, 1410 A.H

323) Tārīkh al-turāth al-'arabī, Fu'ād Sizgīn, Qum, Maktabat al-mar'ashī

324) Tārīkh al-umam wa l-rusul wa l-mulūk, Muḥammad Ibn Djarīr al-Ṭabarī, Beirut, al-A'lamī, 1983. Another publication Edited by : Muḥammad Abu l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm, Cairo, Dār al-ma'ārif

325) Tārīkh al-ya'qūbī, Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Wāḍiḥ al-ya'qūbī, Beirut, Dār Ṣādir

326) Tārīkh Baghdād, Abū Bakr Aḥmad Ibn 'Alī Khaṭīb Baghdādī, Beirut, Dār al-kitāb al-'arabī

327) Tārīkh Biyhaq, Abu l-Ḥasan 'Alī Ibn Zayd Biyhaqī, (Ibn Fanduq), Edited by: Kalīm Allāh Ḥusaynī, Ḥaydarābād

328) Tārīkh Djurdjān, al-Sahmī, Edited by: Muḥammad 'Abd al-Mu'īd Khān, Beirut, 1407 A.H

329) Tārīkh Falsafih dar Islām, Vol 2, Edited by: Miyān Muḥammad Sharīf, The persian version, Tehran, 1407 A.H

330) Tārīkh Guzīdih, Ḥamd Allāh Mustuwfī, Edited by: 'Abd al-Ḥusayn Nawāyī, Tehran, 1404 A.H

331) Tārīkh Ibī Zur'a al-dimashqī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Amr Ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Naṣrī, Dirāsa wa Taḥqīq, Shukr Allāh Ibn Ni'mat Allāh al-Qūdjānī

332) Tārīkh Ibn al-Wardī, Zayn al-Dīn 'Umar Ibn Muẓaffar Ibn al-Wardī, Nadjaf, 1389 A.H

333) Tārīkh Ismā'īliyān, Bernard Lewis, Translated by: Firiydūn Badrihī, Tehran, 1404 A.H

334) Tārīkh Khalīfat Ibn Khayyāṭ, Edited by: Akram Ḍiyā' al-'Umarī, Riyāḍ, 1405 A.H

335) Tārīkh Makka, Aḥmad Subā'ī, Mecca, 1372 A.H

336) Tārīkh Sūriyya wa Lubnān wa Filisṭīn, Philip K. Hitti, Translated by: Kamāl al-Yāziḍjī, Beirut, Dār al-thiqāfa, *3rd edition*

337) Tārīkh Tārīkhnigārī Islāmī, Franz Rosental, Translated by: Asad Allāh Āzād, Mashhad, 1368

338) Tārīkh Tmaddun, Will Durant, Tehran, Intishārāt Āmūzish Inqilāb Islāmī, Second Edition

339) Tārīkh Yaḥyā Ibn Mu'īn, Edited by: Aḥmad Muḥammad Nūr Sayf, Riyāḍ, 1399 A.H

340) Tārīkhnegārī dar Islām, Translated and Edited by: Ya'qūb Āzhand, Tehran, 1403 A.H

341) al-Taḥqīq fī Kalimāt al-Qur'ān, Ḥasan al-Muṣṭafawī, Tehran, 1360

342) Ta'sīs al-shī'a li 'Ulūm al-islām, al-Sayyid Ḥassan al-Ṣadr, Tehran, al-A'lamī

343) Taṭawwur al-fikr al-siyāsī 'Ind Ahl al-sunna, Khayr al-Dīn al-Sawī, Ummān, 1992 A.H
344) Tabṣirat al-'awām fī Ma'rifa Maqālāt al-anām, Edited by: 'Abbās Iqbāl, Tehran, Asāṭīr
345) Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ, Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī, Beirut, 1374 A.H
346) Tadhkirat al-khawāṣ, Sibṭ Ibn al-Djūzī, Tehran, Niynawā
347) Tadjārib al-umam, Abū 'Alī Muskuwayh, Edited by: Imāmī, Tehran, Surūsh
348) Tadrīb al-rāwī, Djalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, Medina, 1392 A.H
349) Tafsīr al-furqān, Muḥammad al-Ṣādiqī, Beirut, 1397 A.H
350) Tafsīr al-manār, Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā, Beirut, Dār al-ma'rifa
351) Tafsīr al-munīr, Wahba Zuḥaylī, Damascus, Dār al-fikr
352) Tafsīr al-qurṭubī, (al-Djāmi' li Aḥkām al-Qur'ān), Muḥammad Ibn Aḥmad al-Anṣārī al-Qurṭubī, Edited by: Aḥmad Ibn 'Abd al-'Alīm al-Bardūnī, Beirut, Dār Iḥyā' al-turāth al-'arabī
353) Tafsīr Furāt al-kūfī, Furāt Ibn Ibrāhīm Ibn Furāt Kūfī, Najaf, al-Ḥaydariyya
354) Tahdhīb al-kamāl, Djamāl al-Dīn Ibi l-Ḥadjdjādj Yūsuf al-Mizzī, Edited by: Bashshār 'Awwād Ma'rūf, Beirut, 1402 A.H
355) Tahdhīb Tārīkh Dimashq, 'Abd al-Qādir Badrān, Beirut, Dār al-masīra
356) al-Tamhīd li Tārīkh al-falsafat al-islāmiyya, Muṣṭafā 'Abd al-Rāziq, Cairo, 1966
357) al-Tanbīh wa l-ishrāf, Abu l-Ḥasan 'Alī Ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Mas'ūdī, Edited by: 'Abd Allāh Ismā'īl al-Ṣāwī, Cairo, 1406 A.H
358) Tanqīḥ al-maqāl fī Aḥwāl al-ridjāl, Asad Allāh al-Māmaqānī, Tehran, al-Murtaḍawiyya
359) Taqwīm Taṭbīqī Hizār wa Pānṣad Sālih Hidjrī Qamarī wa Milādī, Ferdinand Wustenfeld, Edited by: Ḥakīm al-Dīn Qurayshī, Tehran, 1402 A.H
360) Tardhimat al-imām al-Ḥusayn, Ibn Sa'd, Edited by: 'Abd al-Azīz Ṭabāṭabāyī, Printed In Turāthunā Magezine, N.10
361) Tardjimat al-imām 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib, Ibn 'Asākir, Edited by: Muḥammad Bāqir Maḥmūdī
362) Tardjimat al-imām al-Ḥasan Min Tārīkh Dimashq, Ibn 'Asākir, Edited by: al-'Allāmat al-Maḥmūdī, Beirut
363) Tardjimat al-imām al-Ḥasan, Ibn Sa'd, Edited by: 'Abd al-Azīz Ṭabāṭabāyī, Printed In Turāthunā Magezine, N.11
364) Tardjimat al-imām al-Ḥusayn Min Tārīkh Dimashq, Ibn 'Asākir, Edited by: al-'Allāmat al-Maḥmūdī, Beirut
365) Tathbīt Dalā'il al-nubuwwa, 'Abd al-DjabbārIbn Aḥmad al-Hamaḍānī, Edited by: 'Abd al-Karīm 'Uthmān, Beirut, Dār al-'arabiyya
366) *Taysīr* al-maṭālib fī Amālī al-imām Abī Ṭālib, Abū Ṭālib Zaydī, 1395 A.H

367) al-Thiqāf, Ibn Ḥibbān, Ḥaydar Abād, Beiut, 1403 A.H
368) al-Tibyān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān, Abū Dja'far Muḥammad Ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī, Edited by: Aḥmad Qaṣīr, Beirut, Dār al-iḥyā al-turāth al-islāmī
369) Tuḥaf al-'uqūl, al-Ḥarrānī, Tehran, Islāmiyya
370) 'Umdat al-ṭālib fī Ansāb Āl Abī Ṭālib, Ibn'Inaba, Najaf, 1380 A.H
371) al-'Uthmāniyya, Abū 'Amr al-Djāḥiz, 1384 A.H
372) 'Uyūn al-akhbār al-Riḍā, Shiykh Ṣadūq, Najaf, 1390 A.H
373) 'Uyūn al-akhbār, Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh Ibn Muslim Ibn Qutayba al-Dīnwarī, Cairo, 1383 A.H
374) 'Uyūn al-athar fī Funūn al-maghāzī wa l-shamā'il wa l-siyar, Abu l-Fatḥ Muḥammad Ibn Sayyid al-Nās, Edited by: Muḥammad al-Khaṭrāwī, Muḥyi l-Dīn Mastū, Medina, 1413 A.H
375) 'Uyūn al-tawārīkh, al-Sifr al-awwal, Muḥammad Ibn Shākir Ibn Aḥmad al-Kutbī, Edited by:: Ḥisām al-Dīn al-Qudsī, Cairo, 1980
376) Uṣūl Asmā' al-mudun wa l-mawāqi' al-'arāwiyya, Djamāl Bābān, Baghdad, 1989
377) al-Umawiyyūn wa l-bīzanṭiyyūn, Aḥmad al-'Adwī, Cairo, al-Dār al-qūmiyya lilṭibā'a wa al-nashr
378) al-Umawiyyūn wa l-khilāfa, Ḥusayn 'Aṭwān, Beirut, 1986
379) al-Uns al-djalīl Bi tārīkh al-quds wa l-khalīl, Mudjīr al-dīn Ḥanbalī, Qum, 1410 A.H
380) Usd al-ghāba, Ibn al-Athīr, Beirut, *Dār Iḥyā' al-turāth al-'arabī*
381) al-Wā'il, Abū Hilāl 'Askarī, Damascus, 1975
382) al-Wāfidāt Min al-nisā' 'Alā Mu'āwiya, Edited by: Sukayna al-Shahābī, Damascus
383) Wafā' al-wafā' Bi Akhbār Dār al-muṣṭafā, Nūr al-Dīn 'Alī Ibn Aḥmad al-Samhūdī, Beirut, 1404 A.H
384) Wafayāt al-a'yān, Ibn Khallakān, Edited by; Iḥsān 'Abbās, Qum, 1969 Waq'at Ṣiffīn, Naṣr Ibn Muzāḥim al-Minqarī, Edited by: 'Abd al-Salām Hārūn, Cairo, 1382 A.H
385) Waq'at al-djamal, Muḥammad Ibn Zakariyyā Ibn Dīnar al-Ghallābī, Edited by: Muḥammad Ḥasan Āl Yāsīn, Baghdad, 1390 A.H
386) Wasā'il al-shī'a ilā Taḥṣīl Masā'il al-sharī'a, Muḥammad Ibn Ḥasan al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī, Beirut, 1391 A.H
387) Yathrib Qabl al-islām, Muḥammad al-Sayyid al-Wakīl, Djidda, 1409 A.H
388) Zād al-ma'ād, Ibn Qayyim al-Dhawziyya, al-Mu'assisa li l-Ṭibā'a wa l-nashr
389) al-Zīna, Abū Ḥātam Aḥmad Ibn Ḥamdān Rāzī, Edited by: 'Abd Allāh al-Sāmirrā'ī
390) al-Zawādj al-muwaqqat fī l-islām, Dja'far Murtaḍā, Qum
391) Ẓahar al-islām, Aḥmad Amīn, Cairo, Maktabat al-Nahḍat al-qāhira